

INFORMATION LETTER

NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION

Not for
Publication

For Members
Only

No. 1073

Washington, D. C.

February 12, 1946

CONVENTION ISSUE

This issue of the INFORMATION LETTER is devoted largely to reporting the annual Convention of the Association, held last week in Atlantic City. It carries not only a running account of the meetings, but reproduces full texts of all the addresses made at the general sessions, the special program arranged for fish canners, and the Raw Products Conference. The papers presented at the Canning Problems Conferences will be published later, as soon as they are assembled. The regular Saturday issue date of the LETTER will be resumed next week with the issue of February 23.

Convention Sidelights

President Stare's gavel was a gift of his home-state canners. Constructed of steel-hard Wisconsin black walnut it was fabricated in the same formula as the one built for Jack Garner, after "Texas Jack" had broken four mallets in one day presiding over the Senate. . . . Secretary Carlos Campbell was host to a dinner for secretaries of the State and regional canners associations where continuation of close coordination between activities of the national and sectional groups was discussed. . . . It took 51 hotels to house all the delegates, not to mention uncounted hall bedrooms, garage attics, and trailers and those who commuted from nearby towns every day.

Grousing about accommodations and service dwindled after it was realized that many of the hotels had had only a brief time to get ready after the Army turned them loose. . . . The annual dinner-dance given by the Canning Machinery & Supplies Association had among special guests, the N.C.A. President and Secretary. Tickets were at a premium, the entertainment up to the usual standards established by this event in past years.

... Morgan Beatty, noted radio news analyst, staged a public broadcast (See Convention Sidelights, page 69)

Sustained Production, with Emphasis on Foreign Trade, Chief Convention Highlight

Sustained production, with emphasis on quality, and an increasing interest in the development of foreign trade were the major notes sounded in the proceedings of the annual Convention of the National Canners Association at Atlantic City, February 4 to 6.

Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson, in his address before the general session on February 5, urged the continuance of full production and constant quality improvement. Dr. W. I. Myers, Dean of the New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University, at the opening session, February 4, developed this thought also, stressing high-quality diet, better feeding, as the means whereby canned foods products can best get into volume consumption.

In the speeches of Lord Halifax, the British Ambassador, at the same session, and of Arthur Paul, Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, on the special program arranged for fish canners February 5, as well as in the panel discussions of the Government's 1946 program for processed foods, the furnishing of food supplies abroad was stressed.

Quantity and Quality Production Stressed

Various elements of the Convention program were aimed at support of the idea of maintaining quantity and quality production. The special conferences on canning technology, conducted by the Association's Research Laboratories, and similar sessions on Raw Products Research, sponsored by the N.C.A. Raw Products Bureau, brought to the fore considerations of various problems, the solution of which will accelerate and streamline the productive facilities of the industry. The huge exhibit staged by the Canning Machinery & Supplies Association, occupying 65,000 square feet of floor space in Convention Hall, displayed improved and highly developed mechanized units that will contribute to high-geared production.

The Association likewise had anticipated the interest in foreign trade. Its Board of Directors, in an all-day session preceding the opening of the Convention, authorized the development of foreign trade activities.

Chief among the formal resolutions, presented by Chairman E. R. Elwell of the Resolutions Committee, and passed at the closing ses-

sion on February 6, were those urging upon government agencies every effort to facilitate recruitment of manpower for food canners, endorsement of the program of informative labels for canned foods developed by the Association's Committee on Labeling, and approval of the continuation of the nutrition studies jointly sponsored by the N.C.A. and the Can Manufacturers Institute. Full text of these and other resolutions voted appears on page 59.

The Convention re-elected Fred A. Stare of Columbus, Wis., to serve a second term as president; named Emil Rutz of Sunnyvale, Calif., as first vice-president; Alfred W. Eames, San Francisco, second vice-president; Carlos Campbell, Washington, D. C., secretary; and Frank E. Gorrell, Washington, D. C., treasurer. The full list of officers, members of the Board of Directors, and the 1946 Finance Committee membership, as reported by Chairman G. Sherwin Haxton of the Committee on Nominations, is reproduced on page 61.

Attendance at the over-all Convention, including N.C.A., the National Food Brokers Association, C. M. & S. A., and the National-American Wholesale Grocers Association, along with the several other food processing and commodity organizations present, was estimated at approximately 18,000. Nearly 16,000 of this was figured by the Atlantic City Convention Bureau from registrations in the 51 hotels used by the above organizations and the balance is accounted for in the fact that people attended the Convention who had found accommodations in private homes or who drove in from nearby locations.

The psychological value of this first peace-time gathering of canners with allied trade groups is not to be overlooked, according to one prominent canner who said: "Conventions like this are as beneficial as the old-time 'revival' meetings. At no single time in the year do food producers and buyers possess all the information they need with which to draw their contracts. Even should they have the advantage of a completed government program—this might be changed in a week's time, and other factors such as production figures, acreage, yield, etc., are constantly subject to the elements. No man can foretell what Mother Nature will do. But just as the 'revival meeting' of the past served to keep the 'churches going, so do these Conventions engender enthusiasm, encourage enthusiasm and ambition, and create incentive. In that respect they have an important influence on the progress and growth of the industry."

President's Opening Remarks

The N.C.A. program was opened in Westminster Hall, Hotel Chelsea, on the morning of February 4, with an invocation by the Reverend Thomas A. Fraser, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Alexandria, Va. President Stare, who presided at all the general sessions, made a brief address of welcome, saying in part:

"This is the first full-fledged convention our association has been able to hold since January, 1942.

"We will not have to talk about increasing production of canned foods to help win the war, for that has been accomplished, but there are many problems confronting our industry in the post-war period that we will have to solve if we are to maintain the industry's record of progress.

"Let us hope, and work to the end, that some of our problems will be solved or plans made for their solution before we leave here.

"For the past few years, we have been squeezed in a slowly tightening vise of restrictions and regulations, but the pressure has been noticeably lessened and we can at least hope for further relief as time goes on.

"Fortunately, for the majority of us, we do not have much of a reconversion problem involving tearing out special equipment for war and reinstalling equipment for peace. Our plants and equipment can produce for peaceful use with a minimum of change. What we need to know from the Government is:

"Will there be a continuation of controls under which we are to operate in 1946? If so, what is the program?

"Can we leave here, and know with certainty, whether the subsidy, which we do not like but which seemed to be the only solution, will be withdrawn or continued?

"If withdrawn, will the ceiling prices be raised to an equivalent amount?"

Urge High-Quality Diet

The first guest speaker at the opening session was Dr. Myers. In his address on "Post War Agriculture," excerpts of which appear on page 34, the speaker said that it is of primary importance for national policies to stabilize prices and employment at favorable levels, renouncing negative programs like production controls. "If we can move toward the goal of a high-quality diet, the agricultural problem will be that of the limitations of food production capacity rather than surpluses," he stated. Dean Myers listed four essentials in working toward the "high-quality diet" goal:

(1) adequate consumer purchasing power to buy the needed foods; (2) a knowledge of the importance of nutrition by consumers, and knowing how

to combine different foods to get a good diet; (3) applying government support price funds, if any, to aiding low-income families to obtain adequate diets; and (4) the production, processing, and distribution of the kinds and amounts of food necessary.

Canners were urged to support expanded educational programs to teach the essentials and importance of nutrition to urban as well as rural people. "The work is slow, but constructive, and results in high returns per dollars invested," Dr. Myers explained. "All of us would see quicker action if trade associations such as yours, individual food companies, producer groups, and the like would combine in their advertising the advantages of their own products with the story of the high quality protective diet of fruits and vegetables, milk, meat and other vital foods."

Plant Sanitation Program

The next subject dealt with an important Association program, that of plant sanitation, and was presented by Norris H. Sanborn of the Washington Laboratory, who has handled these activities. Mr. Sanborn's paper is reproduced in full on page 34, and offers a full statement and review of the program, which actually began with N.C.A. appointment of a Sanitation Committee in 1913 and encompassed its adoption of a comprehensive Sanitary Code in 1923. Mr. Sanborn dealt with the legislative aspects of the question, the educational approach, the program of cooperation with State canners associations. He summarized by saying that "the industry's sanitation program can be made successful by the joint efforts of individual canners, State associations and the N.C.A. The final measure of success, however, will depend on the extent to which individual canners avail themselves of the information and methods at their disposal, and bring sanitary principles to bear on every detail of factory operation."

Tribute to General Hardigg

At this point in the program, Howard Cumming, of the N.C.A. Planning Committee, rose to pay a tribute to Major General Carl A. Hardigg, Chief of the Subsistence Branch of the Army Quartermaster Corps, who has been a familiar and respected figure at practically every Association meeting held during the war. Following the general address on the "Army Postwar Plan for Canned Food Procurement" (see page 36), the Association presented him with a scroll on which the following tribute was engraved:

NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION

to

Major General Carl A. Hardigg

Office of the Quartermaster General

The National Canners Association, on behalf of all members of the canning industry, extends to you this expression of sincere appreciation of the high qualities of leadership and business acumen you have shown in the task of providing food for the largest armed forces in the Nation's history. You have combined knowledge of needs with foresight in meeting them, firmness in decision with willingness to cooperate, frankness with open-mindedness. Withal, you have shown a desire and capacity for real understanding of the industry's problems that has won you the respect and confidence of the entire industry.

FRED A. STAKE, President.

In his discussion of the Army's post-war procurement program, General Hardigg stated that "as long as canned fruits and vegetables are in short supply it will be necessary for us to buy them by negotiation, and if they are very short, some form of allocation will undoubtedly be necessary. When the supply exceeds the demand, it will undoubtedly be necessary to use some sort of bid and award system, as I am sure the trade will be very dissatisfied if we negotiated with one group of canners for supplies at prices higher than some other individuals or groups are willing to sell.

"We all sincerely hope that the canners will maintain their interest in supplying the Armed Forces and that it will not be necessary again for us to depend largely on specialists for our supplies.

"As to when we shall buy, I can only refer to the uncertainties under which we are operating, and consequently it will be to our advantage to delay purchases as long as possible in order to have the very latest forecast of future needs. We also realize that delaying the purchase too long may add greatly to the difficulties of obtaining our needs. With both of these in mind, it will be my recommendation that we look over our needs and be ready to buy during or at the close of the packing season."

Address by Lord Halifax

The second general session, on the afternoon of February 4, was featured by the appearance of Lord Halifax, before a capacity audience in Westminster Hall, Hotel Chelsea.

The British Ambassador stressed the need for the continuance in peace of the close cooperation between Britain and America that had so effectively achieved victory in the war. He pointed to the serious food shortage existing in Europe and Asia, saying that "The world will be full of hungry people this year. Hungry people are

naturally and inevitably discontented people; and hunger and discontent are a poor foundation for the peaceful and prosperous world we are trying to build. This surely lays an added obligation on all those, who like the members of this Association, are producing food and preparing it for consumption. There could be no better service to the world or to the cause of peace in such a time as this than to increase in every possible way the supplies of food available." The full text of the Halifax address is carried on page 37.

Need for Nutrition Research

Final speaker at the second general session was Dr. Charles Glen King, Scientific Director of the Nutrition Foundation, who spoke on "Nutrition Research and the Food Industry" (see full text on page 39). Dr. King described the Foundation's program and reviewed its accomplishments. He asserted that in the over-all development of research supported by the food industry "there is unquestioned need for strengthening two additional major types of organization; one, to conduct research within each individual company, and second, to develop somewhat broader areas of research which are largely noncompetitive, but of immediate interest to several firms." He said further:

"Studies of a basic nature augment and strengthen the work of individual company research laboratories and also the association type of program.

"In addition to the work of individual company laboratories, one should emphasize, too, the role of trade-type research programs, such as the excellent work conducted by the National Canners Association.

"It is a pleasure to comment specifically on the project devoted to a study of the nutritive value of canned foods carried out by your own group and the Can Manufacturers' Institute. The American public, and especially the armed forces, owe you a distinct debt of gratitude. I know that many of you spent a great deal of time on the project, and I would guess that the venture had been satisfying. It was no small task to handle the details for making extensive analyses of 823 samples, in scattered university laboratories, and including 32 different products. Nevertheless, beyond the immediate value of the data, such work stimulates continued efforts to improve products and processes and to search for superior sources of raw materials."

Government's 1946 Program

The final general session of the N.C.A. program on the morning of February 5 dealt with the Government's agricultural program and the pricing policies for 1946. Starting off with Secretary Anderson's keynote ad-

dress, the program continued with a speech by E. F. Phelps, Jr., Price Executive, Wholesale-Retail and Fruit and Vegetable Branches of the Office of Price Administration, and with discussions led by A. E. Meyer, Director of the Fruit and Vegetable Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, assisted by Leonard S. Fenn, Chief of the Vegetable Marketing Division; F. L. Sutherland, Chief of the Processed Products Standards and Inspection Division; and M. McCown, Acting Chief of the Deciduous Fruit Section.

Secretary Anderson, whose full address appears on page 41, stated that USDA policy "has been and will continue to be directed toward eliminating wartime controls just as soon as it can be done without jeopardizing economic balance, without contributing to inflation." However, the Secretary pointed out, food prices are still pressing hard against ceilings and if every lid were lifted today a substantial rise in living costs would occur. This is why the President has requested Congress to extend price control and subsidies beyond June 30, he explained.

Pursuant to this policy, he stated, USDA and OPA have been advised that subsidies will be continued on major vegetables under price control, if Congress provides the authority. One exception, however, is snap beans on which both price control and subsidy are suspended for the 1946 pack.

The Secretary called attention to the joint USDA-OPA announcement of area average prices for vegetables (see page 70). This announcement was received at Atlantic City, copies were run off and distributed by the Association to the Convention sessions.

Ceilings to be Adjusted

"So that growers and processors may know what to plan for 1946, it has been announced that the same gross maximum prices will be continued on processed vegetables and that if Congress does not provide the authority for continuing subsidies, ceiling prices will be increased by the amount of the subsidy," Mr. Anderson stated, adding that the present subsidy program for tomatoes and tomato products is being extended to include packs through February of this year.

The Secretary told the canners that USDA will not undertake to support the price of vegetables for processing or processed vegetables packed in 1946, nor will a processor-certificate program be undertaken.

He added that sugar will continue to be a problem throughout the year, al-
(See *Sustained Production*, page 69)

Excerpts from Speech on Postwar Agriculture

By W. I. Myers, Dean, College of Agriculture, Cornell University

OPENING SESSION

Employment at good wages will enable a majority of consumers to buy high quality foods. To achieve this, government policies to maintain stable price levels and to encourage private business in providing an abundance of jobs are of first importance.

If the general price level declines, farm prices will decline faster and further. That's what happened in 1920-21. Farm prices fell 50 percent in about a year. If the general price level remains stable, we can expect a moderate decline in farm prices. If the general price level rises moderately over a period of a couple of years, farm prices would decline little, if any.

Food processors as well as food producers have done a magnificent job in food production. We have had the largest food production in history with the smallest labor force, and in spite of shortages of machinery and many supplies. Every reasonable person agrees on the desirability of cushioning shocks of reconversion to farm people as well as war workers. A solution as to how this can be done without serious injury in the longer run to farmers is not so simple.

An orderly transition from war prices and production to peacetime levels is highly desirable. It would probably be better for farmers and the nation to taper off support prices than to end them too soon. Support prices should not be used as a device to prevent a general decline in farm prices. Whatever we do or try to do in attempted manipulation of prices or control of production, farm prices will continue to follow the trend of the general price level.

High employment and production in cities are associated with prosperity of agriculture. High consumer incomes mean good demand at favorable prices especially for choice foods such as meat, milk, eggs, vegetables, and fruit. Good farm incomes contribute to full employment in cities through demand for farm goods and services. There is an enormous backlog of demand, services and materials. We must build homes, other buildings; we need machinery, farm equipment and other materials. We cannot stabilize one part of our economy for long at levels substantially above the rest. We will swim or sink together—farmers and city people alike.

Farm incomes will not be favorable unless the national income is substantially above prewar figures. The national income is the product of employment and business activity, times, wages and national prices. We must avoid severe declines in general prices and wages, in order to maintain high levels of productive employment. Hence national policies to solve these problems are of first importance to agriculture and to the nation. Stabiliza-

tion of the general price level and maintenance of high levels of productive employment are closely related. We cannot maintain high employment when prices are falling.

Consumers must understand the importance of nutrition for health and well-being, and know how to combine different foods to get a good diet. We must continue to expand educational programs to teach the essentials and importance of nutrition to urban as well as to rural people. Such programs are slow in progress but realize high returns for dollars invested. For example, advertising by individual food companies, by trade associations, by producer groups, and others should be directed at the nutritional values of the food advertised rather than at the trade name or commodity itself. Such advertising might well combine the advantages of the product advertised with a story depicting the advantages of a high quality protective diet of meat, milk, vegetables and fruits.

If government funds are to be used to support farm prices after reconversion they should be used to enable low income families to obtain adequate diet. Instead of subsidizing exports, let's begin our charity at home and provide a good diet for everyone, especially mothers and children. The purpose of this type of program is to provide better nutrition and not simply a market for surplus products. One of the best programs of this nature is a permanent school lunch program which would have both Federal and State support. An adequate diet through the right type of school lunch program means healthy bodies for children and it is one of the best ways to develop good food habits during the formative period.

We also should have a workable plan to provide government aid to enable every family to buy protective foods

for adequate diet. Such a plan should be placed on a permanent basis with provision for rapid expansion at the onset of severe depression.

If we produce, process and distribute the kinds and amounts of food necessary for a high quality diet our problem will be one of limitations of food production capacity rather than problems of food surpluses, if we really feed our people reasonably well. The United States has an unique opportunity to develop the proper type of food production program. We can produce the meat, milk, eggs, vegetables and fruits needed in generous quantities for a good diet. They are also the foods which make the greatest use of our resources because they require larger amounts of labor or land or both to produce than do cereals.

Some States already have set up research and education studies to determine the proper methods of producing, processing and distributing foods so as to assure consumers receiving food with the highest possible nutritive content and quality flavor. Under a program just getting under way in New York State, studies are being made in an effort to devise plans for increasing the vitamin content as well as the taste and appearance of foods, to reduce losses in palatability and nutritive value in marketing and processing, and to reduce cost of production, processing and marketing of our farm products. The plant breeders job is getting more complex. He must strive to produce varieties of fruits and vegetables with the highest possible vitamin content, as well as yield values and yet retain appearance and disease resistance characteristics. Preliminary work shows some apples have as much vitamin C as oranges—others have very little. Unfortunately none of these particularly good vitamin-C producing apples are commercial varieties, but they do indicate possibilities that might be explored.

The Industry's Sanitation Program

By N. H. Sanborn, of the N.C.A.
Research Laboratories

OPENING SESSION

The handling, storage or manufacture of any food product for human consumption demands the proper appreciation and application of sanitation. Just what do we mean by "sanitation"? The dictionaries define sanitation in terms of health. One dictionary, for example, defines sanitation as "The removal or neutralization of elements injurious to health." As society advances in its thoughts, new concepts of sanitation are developed. It is not sufficient that a food be handled solely under conditions which will insure freedom from elements injurious to health, although that is, of course, an indispensable requirement. Conditions must be such that the food will not become contami-

nated with any foreign substance whether harmful or not. Sanitation stresses utmost cleanliness. As applied to foods, "sanitation" may be defined as the maintenance of conditions under which foods are handled, stored, or manufactured in a clean, healthful manner which will preclude the incorporation of any extraneous substance.

In the canning industry as in any other group there are some who are more progressive than others. The progressive canner has long been aware of the benefits of sanitation. To an individual packer good sanitation means a clean plant, a better product, compliance with state and federal sanitary requirements and an asset which can be capitalized for its advertising value. A clean plant is necessary to secure freedom from rodents and insects. Good sanitation results in more efficient

operation, better workmanship, fewer accidents, and better personnel relationships.

Better plant sanitation can be made an asset to the canning industry as a whole. The producers of certified milk or meat packers operating under inspection by the Bureau of Animal Industry enjoy a high degree of public confidence. From the standpoint of safety from infectious micro-organisms canned foods are unexcelled. The canning industry could and should match this high degree of excellence with an equal excellence in sanitation. The sanitation of the canning industry as a whole is good. The record proves that. Let us all strive to make it better.

There are two ways of obtaining better sanitation: (1) through legislation and (2) through education. Legislation is necessary in the interests of public welfare, but it is through education that the goal will be reached.

Let us first consider the legislative aspect of sanitation. Under the original Federal Food and Drug Act of 1906, the Food and Drug Administration could sustain a charge of insanitation only by demonstrating the actual presence of objectionable material in the product itself. The Act of 1938, on the other hand, goes far beyond this, providing as it does in Section 402(a) (4), that a food shall be deemed to be adulterated "if it has been prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions whereby it may have become contaminated with filth, or whereby it may have been rendered injurious to health." Under this section, frequently referred to as the "may have" section, it is no longer necessary to establish the presence of filth or an injurious substance if convincing evidence can be presented to establish that conditions were insanitary so that the product may have become contaminated. Notice has been served upon the food industry that greater attention will be paid to this provision of the law by Federal Food and Drug inspectors.

Last summer an inquiry was addressed to Dr. Paul B. Dunbar, Commissioner of Food and Drugs. I know you will be interested in the following portion of Dr. Dunbar's reply, which gives an insight in the thinking of the Food and Drug Administration.

"Here are some of the points with which the inspector must concern himself as far as sanitation is concerned:

1. Is the plant in an area where a rodent problem is to be expected?
2. Is cannery waste or other waste dumped close to the plant, so as to constitute an insanitary nuisance and become a breeding place for flies or other vermin?
3. The building itself is a matter of concern. Is it properly screened?
4. Is the equipment kept clean? Is it so constructed that all parts are accessible for cleaning?
5. Is the drainage such as to permit

the accumulation of spillage, offering additional breeding places for insect life?

6. Is the plant rodent- or cockroach-infested?

7. Are raw materials and manufactured products properly protected?

8. Is the brining equipment properly handled to be sure that the brine is clean from start to finish?

9. Are toilets properly constructed and well-screened from the remainder of the plant? Are they kept clean?

10. Are soap and hot water provided so that hands may be washed after absences of employees from work? Are these facilities used?

11. Are the employees themselves clean? Do they indulge in insanitary practices?

Those are the things I think of insofar as a cannery is concerned. With the answer to all of these questions, however, the inspector then has a decision to make as to whether the conditions found unsatisfactory *may* cause the food product being prepared in the plant to be contaminated with filth. If the answer is in the affirmative, it is our view that the output of the firm is adulterated immediately upon its delivery or offered delivery for shipment in interstate commerce."

Each state likewise has its law pertaining to the sanitation of foods. In some cases, they employ the identical wording of the "may have" provision of Section 402 (a)(4) of the Federal Food and Drug Act. In addition, some states provide detailed regulations regarding canning operations. The conscientious canner has no difficulty in meeting or even exceeding state or federal regulations. Indeed, canners welcome such regulations when properly administered. This is evidenced by the current activities of several state canners associations which are cooperating with enforcement agencies in the formulation of new regulations and dissemination of information on existing requirements.

The educational approach to better plant sanitation is an industry problem. The National Canners Association as early as 1913 appointed a Committee on Sanitation which recommended a set of sanitary requirements for canneries at the Association's Convention in 1914. As a guide to canners, the National Canners Association in 1923 adopted a comprehensive Sanitary Code.

More recently it has become evident that the canning industry should re-examine its position with respect to the newer concepts of sanitation; not in regard to the wholesomeness of canned foods because they have been and are safe, but rather to the esthetic concepts of sanitation. In November, 1944, at Dr. Esty's request, an official of the Food and Drug Administration attended a meeting of the Technical Committee of the NCA Western Branch Laboratory to discuss the Federal sanitation program. Two months later the

San Francisco Laboratory employed a trained sanitarian to conduct a sample survey of a number of representative canning plants. In a comprehensive report the conclusion was drawn that better plant sanitation is possible and that in the great majority of cases conditions encountered reflected a lack of recognition rather than neglect on the part of the management. These conclusions have been verified in a large number of surveys conducted in many parts of the country, and have pointed up the part that education can play.

The NCA has been aware of the need for improved plant sanitation and has discussed this subject with individual canners over a period of years. The results of the original Western Laboratory survey served to focus attention on the need for an intensified sanitation program. Last March, the Administrative Council with the approval of the Board of Directors made provision for work on canning plant sanitation under the direction of the Executive Committee of the Scientific Research Committee. Both the Washington and San Francisco Laboratories immediately started on an educational program. Owing largely to geographical reasons, the principal emphasis of the programs of the two Laboratories differed.

The San Francisco Laboratory added two trained sanitarians to its staff. Individual plant surveys were conducted on a request basis. In all, 185 surveys were made. A number of canner meetings was attended which afforded an opportunity to discuss their sanitation program. The first of a series of sanitation circulars was distributed to all NCA members. This circular brought to the attention of canners excerpts from current publications and an outline for a sanitary survey. Through the efforts of the San Francisco Laboratory the University of California conducted a special training course in plant sanitation. Those who completed this course, together with sanitarians recently employed by individual canning companies and members of both NCA Laboratories engaged in sanitation, has provided the industry with a nucleus of trained personnel.

The San Francisco Laboratory will continue to conduct surveys of individual plants. Canners in the Western area who have not availed themselves of this service are urged to request it. Reports are confidential. The San Francisco Laboratory will continue to meet with canner groups and expects to inaugurate regional short courses in canning plant sanitation.

The Washington Laboratory was confronted with the problem of how best to conduct its sanitation program. Covering as we do the entire area east of the Rocky Mountains, the procedure of making wholesale surveys on a request basis would demand a staff of sanitarians out of proportion to the other activities of the Laboratory. Also, it was thought, surveys on less than a wholesale scale would reach principally the sanitation-minded canners who

would be least benefited by such surveys. Accordingly, the Washington Laboratory has stressed the educational approach through state canners associations, although not ignoring the value of individual surveys.

A number of special meetings was arranged through the cooperation of state secretaries. Such meetings enabled the Laboratory to discuss fully and frankly the need for better plant sanitation and to discuss ways and means whereby the Association could be of most value to canners. From our experience with these meetings we have reached the following conclusions:

1. Any program of sanitation can best be carried out under the immediate control of state canners associations through a committee on sanitation.

2. Cooperation with the state board of health or other state agency charged with canning plant inspection is desirable. In considering a program it should be conditioned to meet local requirements. There are certain states which have set up efficient systems of inspection which go beyond that required by the Federal Food and Drug Administration. Other states either make no provision for organized inspection or do it on an inadequate scale. The consensus of several group meetings was that effective state inspection was desirable and that the means of obtaining this was properly the function of the state association. Several state associations have inaugurated action along this line. The Laboratory has conducted spot surveys for one state association for its guidance.

3. The Laboratory should prepare circulars on the various phases of canning plant sanitation and eventually prepare a complete manual.

4. The Laboratory should assist state associations in conducting regional schools where persons connected with individual canning plants can receive instruction on canning plant sanitation. The Washington Laboratory has been actively engaged in such assistance. To date, three schools or short courses have been held, one by the Michigan Canners Association at Michigan State College, a second by the New York Canners Association in cooperation with the New York State Agricultural Experiment Station, and the third by the Wisconsin Canners Association at the University of Wisconsin. Registered attendance at these schools ranged from 116 to 175. The Tri-State Packers Association has scheduled a school to be held at the University of Maryland during this month. Several other state associations have indicated a desire to hold similar schools.

We have suggested to state associations the desirability of their employing a sanitarian for several months during the canning season to conduct plant surveys. The Wisconsin Canners Association did so last summer and it is expected that other state associations will do likewise this year. The Laboratory will be glad to cooperate with

state association sanitarians. The Washington Laboratory has conducted plant surveys with state inspectors to study their methods and has contacted both state and federal officials charged with food sanitation. We have conferred with and accompanied the NCA West Coast sanitarians on a number of surveys for a mutual exchange of information. To a limited extent, the Washington Laboratory has made plant surveys at the request of individual canners. Papers on canning plant sanitation have been given at several annual conventions of state associations. We have endeavored to have two members of our staff conversant with canning plant sanitation and one of these attended and actively participated in the special training course given by the University of California.

As to this year's program, the Washington Laboratory feels that it is important to complete our contacts with state associations preferably through specially called meetings. We are prepared to conduct spot surveys for their information, to assist in short courses and to render such other assistance as they may desire. It is our intention and also that of the San Francisco Laboratory to accumulate and disseminate information to aid canners in maintaining better plant sanitation. In so far as time and personnel will permit, we shall endeavor to make surveys for individual canners upon request.

The National Canners Association de-

sires to act as a clearinghouse for information and to guide canners in solving their sanitation problems. However, sanitation is an industry problem. It is our hope that every canner will realize that better plant sanitation is possible, that it will be of benefit to his own company, and to the canning industry as a whole. The larger companies may find it advantageous to employ trained sanitarians. Other canners should appoint responsible employees in the capacity of plant sanitarians. In the smaller canneries, the activities of a plant sanitarian need not occupy his entire time but it is important that other duties be of such a nature as not to interfere with his primary function—that of plant sanitarian.

To summarize, then, the industry's sanitation program can be made successful by the joint efforts of individual canners, state associations and the National Canners Association. I have tried to indicate what has been done and is being done by the latter two in the way of organization and education. The final measure of success, however, will depend on the extent to which individual canners avail themselves of the information and methods at their disposal, and bring sanitary principles to bear on every detail of factory operation. This may take a little time, but the interest and enthusiasm with which the program has met thus far leave little room for doubt of success.

Army Postwar Plan for Canned Food Procurement

By Maj. Gen. Carl A. Hardigg, Chief of Subsistence Branch, Army Quartermaster Corps

OPENING SESSION

I greatly appreciate the invitation of the National Canners Association to appear on this program of the first postwar canners' convention. I make my last appearance before you as Chief of Subsistence of the Army, as my successor, Colonel McNamara, reports in Washington this week, and I expect to start on my retirement leave early in March.

The war has been won, and we are now engaged in reorganizing and re-converting for peace. After almost four years of destruction and waste, each of us is trying to look ahead to a better world and plan a future of production for peace.

I know you would like for me to tell you what the Army will do in the future, what our present position is, how much we shall buy in 1946, when we shall buy. I wish I could give you a precise and clear-cut answer to each of these questions.

The Army is engaged in the greatest demobilization in our history. The men are returning from theatres of operation all over the world. They are returning more rapidly than we believed

was possible. The supplies of food required by an army depend upon the number of man days that are to be fed. Obviously, the accuracy of any forecast depends upon the accuracy of the forecast of the number of men to be in the Army each day. Up to this time, we have exceeded all estimates on the rate of demobilization. Stocks of foods are being consumed or disposed of in the overseas theatre. Shipments of many foods must continue, as stocks overseas are not sufficient. These shipments will be at a rapidly decreasing rate in the future as the demobilization progresses. In other words, the Army is liquidating. It is coming down from a strength of about eight and a half million to about one and a half million by July 1, or a little more than one-sixth of its strength of a year ago. Both the organization and our stocks must be correspondingly reduced, but there must be food for the last man in each theatre.

As to our present position, we started promptly after V-J Day to cut back on our contracts and on our buying. Each month as our reports have come in from overseas and at home, we have cut back to bring our stocks into line with present and projected strengths. We have now reached the point where there are no more contracts to be cut back and when stocks on hand are more

than are necessary to meet projected needs, we have no option but to declare them surplus to correct our position. We shall continue to examine our stocks at frequent intervals, but any disposals in the future will be less and less in quantity. Our policy is to hold enough to carry through the packing season, but not beyond December 31. While we are not balanced exactly our total stocks of fruits and total stocks of vegetables are below requirements as now forecast.

As to how much we shall buy, it is obvious that an army one-sixth of the size of last year cannot use more than one-sixth of the food that it used last year. As a matter of fact, it would be considerably less than that, as there will be greater economy in the peacetime utilization of food and stocks will be reduced to peacetime levels. I am sorry to report that the Army will not be the very important customer it has been for the last four years.

As to how we shall buy, I can only say that all of the Government agencies have been very much pleased with the methods followed during the war. All of them would be very glad to follow it if a way can be found.

I believe that as long as canned fruits and vegetables are in short supply it will be necessary for us to buy them by negotiation, and if they are very short some form of allocation will undoubtedly be necessary. When the supply exceeds the demand it will undoubtedly be necessary to use some sort of bid and award system, as I am sure the trade will be very dissatisfied if we negotiated with one group of canners for supplies at prices higher than some other individuals or groups are willing to sell.

We all sincerely hope that the canners will maintain their interest in supplying the Armed Forces and that it will not be necessary again for us to depend largely on specialists for our supplies.

As to when we shall buy, I can only again refer to the uncertainties under which we are operating, and consequently it will be to our advantage to delay purchases as long as possible in order to have the very latest forecast of future needs. We also realize that delaying the purchase too long may add greatly to the difficulties of obtaining our needs. With both of these in mind, it will be my recommendation that we look over our needs and be ready to buy during or at the close of the packing season.

As I finish my task as the war-time Chief of Subsistence and look back over the past four years, I realize that the going has been rough in spots, but the remarkable part of it is that we have been able to accomplish what has been accomplished during the war.

It would not have been possible to have supplied twelve million men and women who were in the Armed Forces and scattered throughout the world if

we had not had the patriotic and whole-hearted support of the food industry. We tried never to cry wolf unless the wolf was at our heels, but we always found the food industry responsive to our call and no part of the food industry was more helpful than the canners.

The food industry also made avail-

able to us the highly trained and efficient personnel to staff our organization. No man could ask for a more highly trained, loyal, or cohesive organization than we have had during the war, and I cannot pay too high a compliment to the ability, patriotism, and energy of the men who made our success possible.

The United States and the British Commonwealth —and the World of Tomorrow

By Lord Halifax, British Ambassador
to the United States

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

We have just emerged from what will, I think, stand out through all time as the most fateful years of recorded history—years in which we have been forced to play for higher stakes than men have ever before thrown on any table. Now, when the struggle has closed, we are able to see how near was the margin on many occasions between victory and failure and how closely our enemies came to achieving their evil purpose of mastery of the world. It was indeed a very near thing; and if I had had time, I would have liked to go back with you in thought over some of the dangers of those months of 1940, memories of which will remain with us, as no doubt they will remain with you, for as long as we are alive.

When we remember the upheaval and earthquake through which we have passed, we can begin to see how difficult it is going to be to get the world again in order; and it is well to remind ourselves what has been the secret of the victory we have achieved. Behind all the gallantry of those who fought, which no words can ever adequately describe, it was the cooperation of those who planned the over-all strategy of the war, the difficult and complicated operations necessary to the deployment in the different war theatres of our strength by land, sea and air, and the pooling of our great industrial resources so as to make them available where they were most required. And behind all the planning and fighting were the men and women in industry, agriculture, and other civilian activities, doing a job as vital to the success of the war effort as any other.

During the five years that I have been in America, I have had the privilege of watching the working of this partnership. I have seen the cooperation of President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill; of the Combined Chiefs of Staff; of our Merchant Marines, and Supply Services, and all the other activities that went to make up the sum of Allied effort. Above all, there was the work of General Eisenhower, if I may take him as an example of the actual fighting forces. When you went into General Eisenhower's office you never knew whether you were

going to deal with an American or a British officer. It made no difference which it was, because General Eisenhower had built up a solid unit which worked and fought its way to victory as a single team.

Now all that picture of cooperation, I think, leads to this conclusion: if this partnership was a necessary instrument of victory, we have got to have it for peace just as we had it for war. That is going to be much more difficult, because war is like a great tidal wave which sweeps over lands and buildings. When it has receded, it is apt to leave behind it a lot of unhealthy conditions, uncertainties and doubts. So we are now faced with problems which in a different way will be as testing as any we have had; and we have not got the same compelling sense of unity, which during the war was a kind of cement of common hopes or fears and held us all together. That is gone, and somehow we have got to build up an impulse and urge for unity not less strong than that we achieved during the war under the threat of dangers and the lure of hopes.

We look out over the world and we see it deeply troubled. We are as one in resolving that neither Germany nor Japan shall ever again be allowed to rebuild that industrial power they so dangerously misused. We must be firm in our resolution that whether it is a matter of two, five, ten, twenty or fifty years, for as long as may be necessary we must be ready to keep a firm grip on the war-making power of those countries. Only by so doing can we make sure that they will never trouble the world again in this way.

Apart from this particular problem, as we look round the world, we see plenty of difficulties; in Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Palestine, Indonesia and China. Over all these fields it is essential to try to work for two objectives. One is to maintain a spirit of confidence and cooperation between the Great Powers. The other is to put all our weight behind the United Nations Organization and to get its machinery into effective working order as quickly as we can.

May I give you an illustration in connection with the economic state of Europe? That continent has had to suffer two revolutions. The first was when the Nazis overran it and cut off the greater part of Europe from the

rest of the world. Having done so, having carried out this amputation, they began to construct a new economic life of a kind, founded on the overriding interests of the so-called master race. The second revolution came with D-Day. Europe was liberated, Germany was invaded. And at once the whole economic system which the Nazis had set up fell to pieces. But while the power house of the plant was destroyed, the old lines of operation were not repaired; and the result, of course, is that today in Europe we have a shortage of almost everything everywhere, and it is immensely difficult to start the wheels of trade revolving once more.

The most serious shortage and one that is perhaps the hardest to realize in a land of plenty like this, is that of food. Your Government has allocated large quantities of meat for export this year, but with all that you can send and that the countries of North Western Europe can themselves produce, most of the peoples of the Continent will still have not much more than one-half the meat they had before the war. The United Kingdom is a little better off. Before 1939 our people consumed on an average 133 pounds of meat in a year. In 1946 they will get an average of 110 pounds, a little more than two thirds of the average meat consumption of people here.

The wheat position is even more serious. During the first six months of this year, before the new harvest comes in, there will be a deficit of 5,000,000 tons. You are sending to Europe what you can spare; so is Canada; so is Australia; and we in the United Kingdom are reducing our stocks to the lowest possible level; but with all that, we are not far off a famine in Europe, especially as, on top of the shortage of wheat and meat, there are equivalent shortages of sugar, fats and oil.

In Asia the situation is equally grave. There one of the staple foods of the people is rice. No one has arrived at a firm figure of rice shortage. It has been put as low as 700,000 tons and as high as 2,000,000; but even at the lower figure it is bad enough. The world will be full of hungry people this year. Hungry people are naturally and inevitably discontented people; and hunger and discontent are a poor foundation for the peaceful and prosperous world we are trying to build. This surely lays an added obligation on all those who, like the members of this Association, are producing food or preparing it for consumption. There could be no better service to the world or to the cause of peace in such a time as this than to increase in every possible way the supplies of food available.

That is one of our most serious problems today. It is also the background of those long talks we had in Washington about the British loan. This, as we all saw it, is an essential part of the great business of trying

to reshape European and world economy. The real question was not whether you would lend us three or four billions of money. And certainly there was never any idea in our minds of asking your Administration to recommend anything to Congress that they did not think in the best interests of America. The large point for decision was whether, by giving us a measure of help, you were prepared to work with us for a new pattern of world economy. I think we all felt that we should merely perpetuate disorder, if we allowed ourselves to drift into a world-wide competition between sterling on one side and the dollar on the other. We would have two areas, each trying to be self-sufficient and compete against the other. The alternative seemed to us much better; namely, to work for a system which would open the world to more exchange, freer trade, and larger opportunities for commerce to flow more freely everywhere, and bring benefit to everybody.

The purpose therefore was not merely to give Britain a measure of help, which indeed we needed, after having cut our export trade to the bone during the war, but something much larger. It was to try to get the whole economic machinery moving again on the right lines through Europe.

I need not remind you how important this is. Discomfort in the world of commerce leads to war, and in that sense commerce is inseparable from peace. A world in want is an unhealthy world and one that is terribly liable to move down dangerous paths. War has never been a solution of that or of any question. Still less is it a solution today, not only because it is more destructive, but because the world is smaller and more interdependent.

And all this argument has been greatly reinforced by the new discovery. Let us never forget that atomic energy may place an immense advantage in the hands of unscrupulous aggressors, who will be tempted to think that the first blow may be the last and that they may cripple another country before war is declared. We should therefore be wise to consider the possibility of another Pearl Harbor attack, this time falling on your principal cities or on ours. The truth is that, as in the old story, we have let the genie out of the bottle, and that now, unless we can control him, he may destroy us. That is why, in absolute priority of effort, we must all devote the best of our thought to how we can develop the peaceful, and ban the unpeaceful, use of this new discovery.

There are two or three things we shall do well to remember. The first is that it is impossible to arrest the march of science, for science, like democracy never goes back. Secondly, I think it improbable that any rules we can devise will stand the test of future war unless we are in a position

to force people to keep them. And thirdly, no one ever starts a war unless he thinks he is pretty sure of winning it.

All this means that we must create conditions, if we can, that will effectively make war itself impossible. And I do not know of any better means of doing this than to make it perfectly and abundantly clear to any aggressor that he cannot win. Can we do this? Can we make the Organization of the United Nations so compact, so resolute, and so strong that it will achieve this end? We know some of the difficulties and time alone can give us the answer, which does not lie only in our hands. But let us be very clear that if we fail in this, we may well be signing a postdated death warrant for our civilization as we have known it.

We may expect a strong and developing argument that if we really mean to make war impossible, the only way is for all the nations to be prepared to enforce complete disarmament for everyone, except for internal police purposes, leaving an international force to deal with breaches of the peace. I suppose we would all feel that even if that could be, as it might, a great insurance of peace, it is still a long way off. Probably neither your nation nor mine would be prepared today to take the risk of leaving security exclusively to some international force. And as international force would have to depend, I suppose, to be fully effective, upon the establishment of something like world government, which all nations, or at least the principal nations, would accept and work. That today seems a long way off too.

Nevertheless, it is healthy and strengthening for us to try to think these things through and to keep our minds receptive. Meanwhile, we have an immediate and abiding obligation to rally the strength of all peace-loving states behind the machinery we have got, that is the United Nations Organization. So I come back to the point that I do not believe there can be any greater contribution to the stability of peace-loving states than a firm British and American understanding. This must be no exclusive business, but should serve as a mighty encouragement to all people who want peace, and a grave warning to all who might be its destroyers. If you and we had kept together from 1920 to 1939 would either Germany or Japan have dared to disturb the world? I have no doubt that had we done so, this war might have been avoided.

Of course, a great many Americans are not going to like a great many Britons, nor a great many Britons to like a great many Americans. I happened to like Americans very much and go along with them, but I am quite sure that we cannot put our association on a sort of honeymoon basis and expect it to last. It does not work that way. Nor have we any right to expect that we are always going to agree on every

thing. You will have your point of view and we shall have ours. You will think we are wrong and we will think you are wrong. And from time to time we shall argue and get cross with each other. But that is not going to matter very much so long as we remember that the minor differences which lie between us are just feather-weight compared with the big values which unite us—respect for human personality, tolerance, and the love of freedom which makes us tolerant. It is through your defense of these values that you are the United States today and not a part of the British Commonwealth. It was our neglect of them that taught us a lesson which I hope we have not forgotten.

A few weeks ago some of our people in England took an action that I think was symbolic of what I have been trying to say. Most of you will have heard of and many of you will have seen St. Paul's Cathedral in London. But I do not know if any of you have seen it since the blitz. In that center of London, the great places of business, the old homes of the City companies, the shops and most of the buildings were destroyed, demolished into rubble and dust. But in the midst, on its hill, stands up this great Cathedral

with the gold cross on the top, almost unscathed.

A few weeks ago some of our people had the idea of building in this central Christian church of the British Commonwealth a chapel that should be consecrated to the memory of Americans who had died in England or, after having had their base in England, had died in operations anywhere. That work is now going forward, and I hope that before many months have passed I may be fortunate enough to be in England, and see the dedication of this chapel to the memory of Americans who have given their lives for the common cause. That surely speaks better than I can of something which lies more deeply in our thoughts and hearts than words are able easily to express. Such an act and such a symbol—there have been others of the like in the past and will no doubt be others in the future, from your side or from ours—can give the encouragement and inspiration through which our two nations may find the will to work together. I do not think in any other way could either render higher service, not only to their own country, but to a suffering and sadly anxious world.

of food intake in relation to health, to initiate new areas of genetic research, and to explore the basic chemical and physical properties of specific materials. There is every reason to keep such projects out in the open.

The Nutrition Foundation was organized by the food industry to develop broad research projects of that nature, in the public interest.

Aside from war work, which received more support than any other part of our program until this year, the Foundation has centered its interest on the following areas:

First, to discover and identify all of the nutrients such as minerals, vitamins, amino acids, sugars and fats that may be essential for complete nutrition, and then find how much of each is ideal for health in man and in his useful animals;

Second, to find how to measure each nutrient accurately, either as it comes into being on a farm, or later taken its course through factories and kitchens to the ultimate consumer;

Third, to discover how each nutrient functions, that is, how it does its work inside a living cell, including the human body;

Fourth, to find how each nutrient can be used to best advantage in the protection of health and in the satisfying of human wants. This type of research should extend through the full life span, including pregnancy, lactation, youth and old age. It should include such stresses as illness and extreme ranges of environment from the tropics to the arctic and up into the stratosphere.

Fifth, to facilitate education, so that the science of nutrition can be made effective without undue loss of time.

You may ask, "Is the science of nutrition so basically important, or has the stress of war led to over-emphasis upon its place in the sun?"

One answer to such a question is to cite the fact that our highest ranking graduate schools, medical schools and schools of agriculture are steadily strengthening their nutrition research programs, both in personnel and laboratory facilities. Specific examples may be cited in Harvard University, Cornell University, University of Wisconsin, Yale University, University of Texas, Vanderbilt University and Washington University. Each has underway a vigorous expansion in nutrition research and graduate training.

Another answer can be given in terms of specific research programs.

At Washington University, for example, Dr. Cori has just added an exciting chapter in the biological sciences, in tracing the course of sugar as the body starts to burn it or convert it into fat. In doing so, he isolated a number of enzymes and then discovered how two of the body's hormones function, on a molecular basis. This is the first time that scientists have found

Nutrition Research and the Food Industry

By Charles Glen King, Scientific Director, Nutrition Foundation

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Several years ago, at one of those delightful research conferences where guests are encouraged to be human, I met a young man on the tennis court who introduced himself as Fred Stare, a student of my friend, Professor Elvehjem. Later, having followed the young man's professional career with interest because he seemed to be indeed promising, I invited him to serve as editor of *Nutrition Reviews*. Dr. Stare accepted the editorship, as a research scientist, and then to my pleasant surprise, I found that his first job as a chemist was in his father's cannery. His interest in nutrition had a very practical background, and I would like to take this occasion to thank his father for doing us a good turn.

One of the greatest difficulties faced by scientists in talking with non-scientists about foods and nutrition, is to keep before them an appreciation of the complexity of anything that is living. This difficulty is present, whether the topic be an apple or the human body. But in a similar vein, one hears many executives express an ardent desire that scientists might appreciate more fully the complexities of business management. That very situation provides a basis for the strong current trend of having an organizational setup in which the research director shares in the top level of administration. Without such a provision for close coordination between

research and policy-making groups, an organization exposes an Achilles heel.

The food industry, of necessity, must work with extremely complicated and often very perishable materials. Such things as bacteria, green leaves, proteins, fats, vitamins and enzymes simply cannot be handled in a modern, practical sense, unless one recognizes their tendency to change.

A second great demand upon the food industry is with regard to public health. When the food intake is too greatly simplified, animal and human health break down. Hence those who are entrusted with the public's food supply are extremely vulnerable to public confidence and good will.

Because of the delicate situation in which food must be made bacteriologically safe, without destruction of desirable nutrients, the canner has long recognized the pressure from both directions. Nevertheless, it is sometimes forgotten that so far as health is concerned, malnutrition can be just as damaging as bacteria. The process is slower, but when a man's teeth decay, or his liver, kidneys and heart fail to function properly, he is no better off than when attacked by bacteria. He can be just as sick as if bitten by a bug.

Our universities and medical schools generally provide the most efficient environment to develop the more fundamental or exploratory types of research, such as isolating, measuring, and discovering the functions of individual nutrients. They are also in the best position to explore many aspects

such a clear basis for understanding how hormones accomplish their control of the body. One of the hormones is insulin, and medical people therefore have a much clearer picture of what has gone wrong inside the body when diabetes occurs. Insulin has been a great boon to humanity in controlling the worst aspects of diabetes, so that a patient can keep going about his work. But picture for a moment how much more it would mean to this and future generations if we could find what causes diabetes, and then find how to prevent it. Continued research in nutrition provides a good prospect of achieving such a goal.

Tooth Decay

Another major disease that is influenced very markedly by nutrition is dental caries, or tooth decay. A recent report from an army officer, Lt. Colonel John C. Brauer, illustrates the extent of tooth decay among the young men of America:

"Records reveal that, at the beginning of the war, nine out of every one hundred selectees were rejected for one or more dental deficiencies. The only requirement for entrance into the Army was that there should be at least three serviceable, opposing, natural masticating teeth (i.e., chewing teeth), and three serviceable, opposing natural incisors (or biting teeth). Dental defects were the leading cause for rejection, eye defects ranked second, mental and nervous defects third, and cardiovascular defects fourth.

"The rejection of this large number of men necessitated the lowering of the dental requirements to meet the demands for induction and manpower. Accordingly, the dental requirements were reduced in March, 1942, and again in October, 1942; since then approximately one selectee per one thousand was rejected for dental deficiencies. Men can now qualify dentally for the Army who have two jaws."

The Foundation has four projects under way that deal with the causative factors underlying tooth decay. There is good reason to feel confident that prevention of tooth decay will be greatly enhanced by improvements in food intake patterns in the immediate future. It doesn't require a prophet to see that each step of that nature toward better public health is going to affect the industry.

In England, for example, data are beginning to show that their radical changes in dietary patterns during the war were not only accompanied by the lowest infant and maternal death rates in their history, and the lowest child death rates from tuberculosis, but also were accompanied by a marked decrease in the incidence of tooth decay. Their diet was monotonous, but it was clearly of higher nutritive quality than before the war. It is perfectly feasible to relieve the monotony without sacrificing nutritive quality.

There is good reason to pay special attention to human maternal feeding problems. A group at Harvard University has reported startling findings from over ten years of systematic study of the effects of maternal diets upon the health of their infants. For example, they found that the chance that an infant would be classified as robust, or nearly perfect in health, was four times greater when the mother's nutrition was good or excellent, compared to those whose diets were poor or very poor. On the other hand, the proportion of infants with health records classed as poor, was twenty times greater when the mother's diets were poor. Intermediate types of diets resulted in intermediate degrees of health.

Continued study and independent checking will be necessary to gain complete acceptance of their findings, as in all such work. The problem is not a minor one, however, on other scores. In recent years there have been nearly twice as many infant deaths associated with physical deformities at birth as there have been from four common diseases of childhood combined, namely, diphtheria, measles, whooping cough and scarlet fever. Dr. Joseph War-kany, at the University of Cincinnati, has shown close relationships between poor nutrition and physical deformities in experimental animals at birth, but there is no comparable information regarding human nutrition.

Unless one is close to the research laboratories, there is a tendency to gain an impression that most of the important problems are already solved. In nutrition research, there is no risk of reaching a saturation point in the near future. Among other basic findings that have been reported in the scientific journals within the past year, aided in part by grants from the Foundation, are the following:

1. Dr. Icie Macy Hoobler's group in Detroit has reported extensive, new information on the composition of mother's milk. Even in this field, which seems so elementary to human feeding, there is still a large amount of work to be done.

2. Dr. Otto Bessey and his associates in New York are developing micro techniques of analysis, so that nutrition surveys can be conducted rapidly and objectively among large population groups, and especially in the schools. Two members of their staff, with assistants, recently collected tiny blood samples—about three drops—from the finger tips of 80 students in about an hour, and by the end of the next day had completed accurate analyses for vitamin C, vitamin A, carotene, protein, hemoglobin and phosphatase. To this list they expect to add soon, two more vitamins and one mineral, without requiring a larger blood sample. Measuring one's nutritional status, which is basic to checking progress toward better food habits, can thus be approached in a manner that removes

a large portion of the present guess-work.

Again, one might suppose that everything of a practical nature would be known by this time about human requirements for protein, including the use of foods like milk, eggs, and meat. Yet most of our knowledge in terms of the basic units or proteins, remains to be published. Within the coming year, an excellent series of reports will probably appear in this field, based on the first broad, well controlled approach to the problem. Meanwhile, on the practical side, physicians working with the Surgeon General's office have reported their discovery that by using high protein diets, the convalescence time after injury from infectious hepatitis, or jaundice, can be shortened by 50 percent or more.

For several years prior to 1945, chemists had been studying an elusive new member of the vitamin B-complex, called folic acid, without knowing whether it would be of value in human nutrition. Meanwhile, they studied chicks, rats, guinea pigs, monkeys and butterfly wings. During the last three months of 1945, four different medical groups reported its curative use in human nutrition, and had agreed that it affords protection against two heretofore baffling diseases, one, a common type of anemia, and the second, a form of subtropical dysentery, called sprue.

An important aspect of recent studies of folic acid and other members of the vitamin B-complex, is with regard to their ease of destruction. This whole area of research is likely to stimulate much greater emphasis upon foods that are fresh or at least prepared and distributed with great care. The dignity of fresh fruit, and a sirloin steak without whiskers, is likely to return.

Food Industry Research

In the over-all development of research supported by the food industry, there is unquestioned need for strengthening two additional major types of organization: *first*, to conduct research within each individual company, and *second*, to develop somewhat broader areas of research which are largely noncompetitive, but of immediate interest to several firms.

Studies of a basic nature, such as I cited in the Nutrition Foundation program, augment and strengthen the work of individual company research laboratories and also the association type of program. I have seen, already, repeated examples of how the exploratory work supported by the Foundation increases the interest of company executives in providing greater support for their own research men; and I have seen four industry-wide, or association type, programs develop in part as an outgrowth of our activities. Each new basic discovery along the research frontier creates added opportunities for the research men in a given company to

improve and extend their own activities. In other words, alert, research-minded companies accelerate their own programs and serve the public more effectively roughly in proportion to the basic scientific advances that become available to them. As an example, note the current interest of the food industry in new methods of measuring amino acids, and in estimating the quality of protein foods in terms of biological assays. Or note the effect that a chemical method of measuring vitamin C has had upon nearly every company that deals with fruits, vegetables, or fluid milk. Unquestionably, the food industry now provides the public with superior products because its chemists have been able to detect changes in vitamin C content during production, processing and storage. The resultant leads have meant better retention of flavor and attractiveness, in parallel with increased nutritive value. This advantage applies to those who are developing improved foods, irrespective of whether they are fresh, frozen, canned or dehydrated. In the cereal field, vitamin B, has played a role about as conspicuous as that of vitamin C in fruits and vegetables. I believe we are going to see, within the very near future, a similar series of rapid developments relative to folic acid and other new, unstable members of the vitamin B-complex. Each respective company will accordingly extend its own research activities and by so doing will improve its products and processes, and the health of the consumer.

In addition to the work of individual company laboratories, one should emphasize, too, the role of trade-type research programs, such as the excellent work conducted by the National Canners Association.

The Refrigeration Research Foundation is also developing a strong research program. Other groups are organized along definite commodity lines, such as those dealing with milk, sugar, meat, corn, bakery goods, and citrus products.

It is a pleasure to comment specifically on the project devoted to a study of the nutritive value of canned foods carried out by your own group and the Can Manufacturers' Institute. The American public, and especially the armed forces, owe you a distinct debt of gratitude. I know that many of you spent a great deal of time on the project, and I would guess that the venture had been satisfying. It was no small task to handle the details for making extensive analyses of 823 samples, in scattered university laboratories, and including 32 different products. Nevertheless, beyond the immediate value of the data, such work stimulates continued efforts to improve products and processes and to search for superior sources of raw materials.

The American pattern of food consumption is still far from being ideal.

both in regard to its nutritive quality and in relation to such practical aspects as convenience, cost, and enjoyment.

The first major world-wide organization to get under way as the war drew toward a close was the group now officially constituted as the Food and Agriculture Organization. The man

selected as President is Sir John Orr, a dean among the world's nutritionists. This development is indicative of the growing world-wide conviction that the science of nutrition is destined to play a vital role in further progress toward human health, scientific agriculture, and improved economic stability.

Opportunities in Appetites

By Secretary of Agriculture

Clinton P. Anderson

THIRD GENERAL SESSION

Over the past century and a half we have had many marvelous discoveries and inventions which have served as the building stones of our modern civilization. When people cite examples of these, they naturally turn to the spectacular things, such as electric power, the internal combustion engine, the automobile, or the airplane. And now, of course, they crystal-gaze into the wonders of atomic energy.

However, there is no doubt that food processing always has and always will be a significant factor in our living and our economy. We take our food more or less for granted, but the fact is that the evolution of modern methods of preserving food is fully as important as, say, the coming of the automobile. Without modern food handling methods, little else could be modern.

Strangely enough, the still Number One technological advance in food processing is around a hundred and thirty-six years old, although it has been constantly improved. I refer to the simple, yet momentous discovery by Nicolas Appert in France shortly after the turn of the nineteenth century that food could be preserved indefinitely by certain methods of preparation and putting it in sealed containers—by what we call "canning."

Appert and the French Government realized that his development of this process was important, but I doubt if they realized that the processes he pioneered would affect more lives—and affect them more favorably—than all of Napoleon's conquests. They did not then foresee that canned foods would help men to open new parts of the world, to pioneer and work far from the usual food producing areas. They did not foresee that canning would open world-wide markets for perishable foods; would enable whole populations to enjoy a wide variety of diet under all climates; would provide the basis of great new industries; and would provide profitable use for millions of acres of farm land.

I keenly appreciate the opportunity to meet this morning with the National Canners Association because I am well acquainted with the many and great contributions this industry made to our war effort, from start to finish. I know how well you cooperated with the Department of Agriculture in meeting the unprecedented demand for more food than any nation has ever

Offered by Canned Foods

produced and processed in like period.

By 1942 the pack of canned vegetables had increased by more than eighty-eight million cases, a gain of sixty-seven percent over the average for the 1935-39 period. The canned fruit pack had gone up about twenty-five percent, or nearly nine million cases, by 1944. The pack of frozen vegetables jumped from seventy-eight million pounds averaged in the 1937-39 period to two hundred and seventy million pounds in 1945. The pack of frozen fruits in 1945 was more than three times the average for the 1935-39 period. Such performance as this made it possible for us to have the best fed military forces in the world, for the home front to be fed even better, on the average, than in pre-war years, and for us to send tremendous amounts of food to our allies. This war job may not have been dramatized in headlines, but it was absolutely essential to the great victory we won.

And now the canning industry, like others, faces many immediate and urgent problems in getting back to a peacetime basis. I wish that I could tell you today that all wartime controls were going to be dropped immediately and that each of you could go your own way in planning your peacetime operations. But the hard fact, the paramount consideration of this period, is that the economic situation is anything but normal. We must maintain our economic balance in this trying period, else we may lose all of our hard won gains and dissipate our great economic strength in inflationary and deflationary floundering. Never has the danger of a flaming inflation been so great—yet never have we been so well equipped as a Nation to prevent that debacle if we use the economic implements we have at hand, plus plenty of old-fashioned common sense. We can't afford to let inflationary pressure get out of hand. And we can prevent it if we are determined to do so.

I want to make the position of the Department of Agriculture absolutely clear regarding price and other controls. Our policy has been and will continue to be directed toward eliminating wartime controls just as soon as it can be done without jeopardizing economic balance, without contributing to inflation. Last fall it appeared that food supplies would continue at a high level, but that demand might slacken off a bit, with reduced military requirements, and large numbers of workers facing temporary unemployment in the shift from war to peace work.

At that time the Department looked toward and encouraged the lifting of controls, in whole or in part, as swiftly as practicable, and started making plans on that basis. The set-aside provisions were suspended for all canned products except tomatoes. The Department recommended the elimination of price ceilings on certain vegetables of which the supply was plentiful, and hoped to add many more to the list. We in the Department looked for the ending of all price ceilings and subsidies this coming June because it appeared—from prospects last fall—that there might be small declines in the level of food prices and the whole cost of living.

However, it now appears that we underestimated the tremendous demand for food, and the great buying power in the hands of workers and returning veterans, among others. Unemployment did not develop to the extent anticipated. The production of consumer goods, which was expected to absorb some of the buying power, did not get underway as fast as was expected. And people's appetites remained just as hearty as ever.

Cannot Relax Controls

The net result is that food prices still are pushing hard against ceilings. If we lifted every lid today, there would be a substantial rise in cost of living. We must therefore move with caution, only relaxing controls as production proves itself capable of holding prices in line. We simply cannot afford to let inflation get out of hand on the food front any more than on any other front. It would hit the central, most vital part of America's everyday living.

In the light of present conditions, and as an integral part of his broad program for maintaining a balanced healthy economy, President Truman has urgently requested Congress to extend the Price Control Act and to continue the food subsidies beyond June 30. He has, in addition, made the sound suggestion that subsidies be tied to definite standards, with provision to drop them as soon as the cost of living declines below present levels.

Now what does this mean for the processors of vegetables for 1946? Stabilization Director John C. Collet has advised the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration that subsidies will be continued on the major vegetables which remain under price control if Congress provides the authority. For one of these major vegetables, however—snap beans—price control on the 1946 pack is being suspended and there will therefore be no subsidy on snap beans.

The Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration have announced the area average prices for vegetables for processing, most of which are the same as last year. Prices of sweet corn and green peas for can-

ning and freezing, and for tomatoes for canning are the same as the area average prices for these vegetables in 1945. The exceptions will be lima beans for processing, for which there will be an increase of five dollars per ton, and cucumbers, for which there will be an increase of eight cents per bushel.

No prices have been designated for carrots and sweet potatoes for canning and cabbage for sauerkraut since these vegetables are not under price control. No prices have been designated for snap beans, fresh shelled beans, and beets for processing since the 1946 pack of these commodities will be suspended from price control.

In order that growers and processors may know what to plan on for 1946, it has been announced that the same gross maximum prices will be continued on processed vegetables and that if Congress does not provide the authority for continuing subsidies, ceiling prices will be increased by the amount of the subsidy.

The present subsidy program for tomatoes and tomato products is being extended to include packs through February of this year.

Before leaving this general subject, I would like to point out that the Department of Agriculture will not undertake to support prices of vegetables for processing or processed vegetables packed in 1946. Moreover, there will be no processor's certification program. Our price support operations were undertaken during the war to assure meeting government requirements. With the active demand for processed vegetables and the anticipated demand for the 1946 packs, the Department of Agriculture feels that there will be no need for a support program this year.

I know you have been anxious to get the government's decision on the whole price and subsidy question. Another question that you need to have information about is sugar. I certainly wish that it were possible for me to say that sugar would not continue to be a pressing problem—but the facts don't warrant optimism. Sugar will be a problem throughout 1946.

However, gradual improvement does seem to be in sight. Crop estimates for some of the major sources of sugar are encouraging. Right now, that means Cuba and Puerto Rico, principally. It is too early to have dependable estimates of the sugar we may produce continentally, but we are making larger payments to cane and beet producers, and the goals are up more than thirty percent for sugar beets and about eight percent for sugar cane. 1945 continental production was the best in recent years and represented an increase of more than 300,000 tons over 1944.

Present sugar rationing restrictions are the tightest since Pearl Harbor. As a nation we have been on the spendthrift side where sugar was concerned.

We have been eating into our stocks. Reserves have sunk to an all-time low level. We are not going to continue the mistake of using more sugar than we are receiving, but on the other hand, we are not going to be over-cautious. As supplies warrant, there will be a loosening in sugar controls. Increases will not be sensational, because we must live within our sugar budget. But brighter sugar days are ahead and we'll begin to see the effect by the time the 1946 fruit pack begins.

Government Purchases

Another question in your minds, I would guess, is "What are government takings of processed fruits and vegetables going to be?" The government's needs for canned vegetables from the 1946 pack, which are practically all for the military, are expected to be roughly two-thirds of the government take during the current season, but only about fifteen percent of the large amounts acquired from the 1944-45 pack. The government's needs for canned fruits, excluding citrus, from the 1946 pack are expected to be less than half of that required during the current season and only about one-tenth of the large amounts taken in the 1944-45 season.

So much for the immediate present. Despite all of the problems involved in reconversion, I am firmly convinced that this is a time of great opportunity to build toward larger and better markets in the future. As we look into the postwar years, there are many lessons from our war experience that we might well keep in mind. There are many signs of the future all about us—and altogether, they make a picture of great potential progress.

During the war when the canning industry achieved such an unprecedented level of production it had an almost unlimited market. Now the war is over and the supplies of canned foods still are short. This situation is in direct contrast to that at the end of the last war when surplus stocks dumped on the market demoralized the canning industry. The end of this war finds the canning industry in a healthy state with a continuing high level of demand. The year 1946 will call for a peacetime record of production. So for this year, markets should be no particular problem.

There will be, however, a big shift in your customers. With the government taking much less, you will be relying mostly on the civilian market. In this market, as you well know, you have increasing competition and I believe that one of the most important efforts toward maintaining your market will be to work for better quality. When consumers have plenty of money to spend, they want the best. And they will be more insistent on good quality as supplies become more readily available in the stores. In spite of the shortage during the war, we found that there

was a definite limit on the amount of low-quality products that could be sold. The outstanding example was low-quality canned snap beans.

Housewives with plenty of money not only want good quality, but they want to be sure of the quality of the product they are buying. And the canners who improve the quality of their product will benefit by putting on the label the information that the housewife wants. The Department of Agriculture, too, is interested in better quality and better labeling. You are all familiar with the Department of Agriculture's processed foods standardization and inspection service and with its continuous inspection program. This service is available to all who want it. It is one that the industry can use to advantage to improve the quality of its products. The increasing demand being made on this service is evidence that fruit and vegetable processors are giving serious consideration to the importance of quality.

Right here I want to stop to say that I congratulate the National Canners Association on the presentation by its Committee on Labeling of a fine report. You are on the right path and the Department of Agriculture is happy to see you moving in that direction.

The canning industry cannot go back to conditions that existed only a few years ago. It has new competition, but it has new opportunities too.

One of the most significant portents to come out of the period of the last few years is the realization of the fundamental value of food, a value that cannot be adequately measured in dollars and cents. We have had our eyes opened as to the need for and the power of food. Never again, we know, can we afford to let our facilities for supplying food be threatened with economic collapse—as in the aftermath of World War I. It was not until depression engulfed our whole economy that we really tried to do anything about it. Never again can we afford to permit a large share of our population to go hungry or ill-nourished. A nation cannot place its food resources and the diet of its people in jeopardy and expect to remain strong.

We have learned the power of an appetite, when it is backed by buying power. We never knew, until the war taught us, how much food the people in this country could consume when they had plenty of jobs and good wages. Our full employment at good wages these past years opened demands for food that were the equivalent, almost, of adding ten or twelve new States full of consumers. We now realize that if we can maintain full employment and fair wages, farmers and processors will be kept extremely busy producing to keep up with the demand.

However, in the long run we need not worry about our ability to turn out and process all the food that this country can eat. All around us, on the farm and in the processing plant, are

new technological advances which are bound to enlarge our capacity to produce, to process, and to market food.

How can we maintain and expand the great capacities for consumption that we now have? That, I think, is the real challenge of the postwar years.

The main objective should be to keep plenty of food dollars in circulation. We know what happens when consumers have plenty of food dollars to spend. In 1944 the public spent more than thirty billion dollars for food. Contrast that with 1933 when consumers had only 11½ billion food dollars.

Per capita consumption of food has climbed steadily as productivity and buying power of the average man has increased. For example, in pre-war years the average per capita consumption of canned vegetables was only thirty-one pounds; today it is running from forty to forty-five pounds. But that is only part of the story. The potential market is expanding. People are eating more—and there are more people. We had one hundred and twenty-four million mouths to feed in 1930, and now we have around one hundred and forty million. By 1950 we will have about one hundred and forty-five million people. Our home market is a growing one.

Now I'm not minimizing the need for better quality, better marketing, progress in nutrition research and education, and other improvements which may expand our markets. Those efforts must continue to keep our food industry up-to-date. During the war, quality was not the primary consideration; we needed the food, the growers were encouraged to "bring in everything but the vines," and it was necessary to pack nearly everything that was brought in. We are going to have to put emphasis on quality again, and on efficiency in producing, processing, and marketing, to make the most of our opportunities and to provide the best possible food for the United States. But I want to drive home the point that the limits of food consumption are set by the buying power of the great mass of people. We should never lose sight of that fact. The amount and the kind of food the great majority of consumers demand depends primarily on whether or not they have a job, and the kind of pay they are getting—on how many food dollars they have to spend.

The direct tie-up between pocketbook and appetite has in it some simple but powerful lessons for farmers and food processors. Let me sum them up: One—people buy more food when they can afford it. Two—the kind of food they buy depends on the amount of money they earn. And three—and I want to stress this—the greatest increase in consumption comes when low-level income families move up to higher income brackets.

Common sense should tell us these facts, even if it takes careful research to measure them definitively. Families

with low incomes subsist mainly on a flour, beans, and potato type of diet. What kind of a market are they for farmers and for the food industry? As they move up the income scale they begin to add to their diet more meat, eggs, fruits, and vegetables. And only when they get a truly adequate income do they eat lots of fruit and vegetables.

Supposing we were able to add a thousand dollars a year to the buying power of each income level. What would that mean in increased demand for fruits and vegetables? We have figured that out, from detailed reports of what non-farm families buy. In terms of pre-war price levels, when you add a thousand dollars a year to the income of the families earning under \$500, each member of that family would eat more than fifty pounds of tomatoes and citrus fruit, about twenty-five pounds more leafy green and yellow vegetables, and ninety pounds more of other fruits and vegetables. Add another thousand dollars and the members of the family would eat still more, but the increase would be smaller—almost forty pounds more tomatoes and citrus fruits, ten pounds more leafy green and yellow vegetables, and sixty-five pounds more of other fruits and vegetables. The third thousand dollars brings a per person gain of twenty-five pounds of tomatoes and citrus, eight or nine pounds of leafy green and yellow vegetables, and about forty-five pounds of other fruits and vegetables. In other words, the first thousand dollars does more than the next two thousand together in adding to fruit and vegetable consumption. To put it another way—the low income groups in this country constitute the largest untapped market in the world for farmers and food processors.

We can tap this vast reservoir of food wants. We must tap it—to assure the Nation of an adequate diet. We know how to tap it—through full production, full employment, and fair wage standards—by maintaining a healthy, balanced economy.

I realize that I am addressing representatives of an industry which has had, historically, a low wage level. I am not attaching blame to that fact—it just happened that way in the development of the industry. I know that it is an industry of intense, widespread, quick-acting competition, which has made it impossible for any one firm to pay significantly higher wages than another and still compete. However, the trend of wages in the canning industry has been upward. Wages for cannery labor generally averaged around thirty-eight cents per hour in 1935 and by 1940 had risen to an average of about forty-six cents. According to the latest figures—those for the first eleven months of 1945—the wage level for canner and preserving labor was around eighty cents an hour.

We might as well face facts, even where they may be unpleasant. Certainly, the large areas in this nation's

economy where low wages have prevailed—yes, in agriculture along with other related industries—have been in the long run unpleasant, unprofitable, and inefficient. We have seen the alternatives. During the depression when the country was running at half speed, any industry could hire workers at low wages. The canning industry could get workers for less than forty cents an hour. But how much could you sell them? Where was your market? Surely, your market dried up for lack of food dollars in pay envelopes—too many people were limited to a diet of beans, flour, and potatoes. In 1932 when wages and employment hit bottom, the consumption of all canned vegetables, fruits, and juices was only thirty-two pounds per capita. Under conditions of full employment during the next two or three years we might expect consumption of these products to run as high as seventy-five pounds per capita.

Cheap Labor Means Poor Prices

We have seen in the recent years of all-out production, with plentiful jobs and high wages, how the demand for food soared to unbelievable heights. It is no accident that farmers and food processors, among others, have experienced their most profitable years when competition for labor was the highest and they have had to pay higher wages to hold their workers.

There is the contrast. Unemployment and cheap labor mean poor markets and poor prices. Full production and well-paid labor mean good prices, expanding markets. Agriculture and the whole food industry have a definite responsibility, the same as the rest of our economy, for keeping up the purchasing power of its workers.

Now the fact is that no industry stands to gain more in widening its markets by increasing the food dollars among the low income groups than does the food processing industry. The problem of underconsumption is most critical at the income level where each additional dollar of wages brings the greatest increase in consumption.

There are some, of course, who say they can't afford to pay wages that provide adequate purchasing power. They may not be able to pay them if they must compete in a free-for-all situation, with no wage standards, but certainly they can if minimum wage standards prevail throughout the country. I say that in the long run there is no industry which can afford not to pay them. Any large group earning less than such minimum wages today is a threat to our whole economy. We cannot achieve a high level of consumption if any large sector of our population can afford only beans, flour, and potatoes.

Full production and full employment is the route to an economy of abundance. There is no other road that takes us to that goal. And the way

to get there is to keep on that road, all of us. I don't believe for a minute that the whole job of shaping the country up to make the most of the postwar period can be done entirely by government, or by any single part of our complex economy. It is a task that demands cooperative planning and action by all of us—agriculture, labor, industry, and government.

No one realizes better than farmers that balanced production is a team-work job. I should like to point out that farmers, as ruggedly individualistic as any Americans, have for a number of years set their production goals and have balanced their production year by year with effective demand. They met the huge goals set in the war years, despite all obstacles. And I am proud, as a representative of the agriculture of the United States, that farmers have indicated through their 1946 production goals, their willingness to produce the foodstuffs needed for a full production economy; their willingness to take the lead in achieving this objective. But farmers

can't do the job all alone. We need, I firmly believe, means by which other parts of the economy can coordinate their efforts toward similar over-all production goals.

We are entering a period unlike any in our previous history. It is a period that holds vast promise on one hand, if we succeed in gearing our efforts to the times, but the threat of serious difficulties on the other, if we fail to measure up to our opportunities. We have at hand all the essentials for building a continuously expanding, phenomenally productive economy. We have the natural resources. We have the factories and the farms. We have the workers with great mechanical skills. We still have time to move ahead on a high level—if we move promptly and as a team. This is a time for bold, well-conceived action. It is, in short, a time for a well-matched team of agriculture, labor, industry, and government to pull together toward the higher standard of living, the great abundance, we are capable of producing.

OPA'S Program for the 1946 Pack of Processed Fruits and Vegetables

By E. F. Phelps, Jr., Price Executive,
Office of Price Administration

THIRD GENERAL SESSION

A couple of weeks ago I read in one of the food trade publications that I had been prevailed upon to extend the date of my resignation until after this convention—because I was the only man the agency could get to tell processors about our "squeeze" program for 1946! I haven't yet decided whether that was an insult or a compliment—but I imagine you'll be relieved to hear that I can't live up to the advance billing.

All OPA men have had some unpopular jobs to do from time to time—and I seem to have had a fairly consistent record in that respect as far as my dealings with processors have gone. Perhaps because I'm returning soon to the grocery business after four years of saying "No" or "We'll consider it," I finally get to announce at this meeting that we don't contemplate a "squeeze" program this year—as a matter of fact, all things considered it looks like a fairly liberal set of proposals. Also, it's a program which has already been approved by the Stabilization Administrator, a considerably more advanced state of affairs than has been the case in other years.

Last fall we had hoped our decontrol program would be moving along by now and we were giving serious thought to no more than a piecemeal program on 1946 processed fruits and vegetables. Particularly, we had hoped it would be possible to decontrol most of the processed vegetables and that we

would not face the necessity of developing a more or less complete program for this year. Instead, the pressure on all food prices may be more acute now than it was then and decontrol has been retarded. Although we've removed controls on some items in the processed fruit and vegetable field, most of them have been of minor importance, with the possible exception of processed citrus. The horror stories surrounding the removal of controls on fresh citrus and coconuts, while they have not affected our criteria for decontrol, have certainly added a note of caution against premature decontrol.

Under these circumstances, continued control in a substantial part of your industry is not only a somewhat reluctant conclusion but a necessity to the continuance of the stabilization program. We will proceed with decontrol just as quickly as it can be justified but the present outlook demands a continuing program for 1946 in order that you can contract and plan your operations.

An important factor in this year's discussions is the disposition of the subsidy question. As the result of a good deal of inter-agency examination and consideration, the Stabilization Administrator on November 9 announced a program for the orderly withdrawal of most subsidies on food. This was believed to be consistent with the stabilization program since it assumed a softening of consumer prices by this time, particularly for some unsubsidized foods. Therefore, any price increases arising out of subsidy withdrawal would presumably not affect

the subsidized cost of living since softening prices elsewhere would compensate.

Actually, this promise hasn't worked out and there are many indications that the cost of living will not decline and that in some areas it may rise. The most important components of the cost of living are food, clothing and housing and, in all three areas, I think you'll agree there is little indication of the softening we had hoped would materialize. Beyond that, the stock market has been moving upward, real estate prices have risen alarmingly and labor difficulties have not lessened the pressure on prices.

Extension of the Subsidy

In view of these facts, the Stabilization Administrator recently amended his November 9 announcement to recognize the situation which has developed. He indicated reconsideration of the original schedule for subsidy withdrawal on foods, and, supported by President Truman, has asked the Congress for an extension of subsidy authority. Such action, of course, is entirely consistent with the continuing responsibility of the stabilization agencies to see that the cost of living and the general level of prices do not rise, and was recommended by OPA. Since this last announcement, the Stabilization Administrator has informed us definitely that subsidy payments on 1946 pack processed fruits and vegetables would be continued, subject to the approval of Congress.

However, in view of the necessity for Congressional approval, this means we will have to present to you a program which recognizes both the continuance of subsidy and its possible removal—and we are prepared to do that.

Thus far, the Department of Agriculture has designated grower prices only on vegetables for canning and freezing. The Secretary has indicated acreage goals and has recommended grower prices on all of the vegetables, with the exception of lima beans and cucumbers, at last year's levels—lima beans and cucumbers will be slightly higher. Finally, in view of estimated requirements and production, it has been decided to remove controls from 1946 pack processed snap beans, shell beans and perhaps one or two additional minor items. As to fruits for processing, the Department of Agriculture will make recommendations later on and I understand the subject will be discussed briefly by them during this program.

Our processor pricing program, however, which can be described briefly in outline, necessarily deals with most processors of both fruits and vegetables, even though grower prices on fruit have not yet been designated. We don't yet have our plans drawn on dried fruits or for one or two smaller segments of the processing industry but

nearly all canners, freezers and other processors of fruits and vegetables should be able to plan on the basis of these proposals. I'll concentrate first on the canner program.

As you know, we have priced most of your industry on an incentive basis, designed to encourage maximum production—although I suppose there are individuals or groups who would question our definition of "incentive." Nevertheless, production has been good and the industry's net position has been favorable. We've just completed our profit study of canner operations in 1944, and we have other studies in progress, but I'm not going to discuss profits or cost surveys in these remarks. It's enough to say that we intend to continue the same incentive basis and methods in connection with the 1946 pack.

If subsidy is authorized, the program looks about like this: We will continue all 1945 canner ceilings, as the basis for 1946 price levels, using Pricing Methods No. 1 and No. 2 as in 1945; then, particularly in the case of canned fruits, we will adjust ceilings upward to reflect increased sugar costs if such cost increases are larger than the inventory windfalls which some processors may realize when sugar prices are increased. The mechanics for taking care of the sugar problem will have to be worked out, but I suggest you record your sugar inventory as of the date of the price increase—which is February 10.

The Stabilization Administrator agrees with us that 1945 ceilings may have to be increased further in the event basic wage rate increases are approved with respect to the 1946 pack. Since increases of this nature have not yet taken place, beyond those already recognized in present regulations, no advance recognition of estimated or possible increases will be authorized now. However, if it becomes apparent that basic wage rate increases are approved in connection with the '46 pack, the Stabilization Administrator will consider a method which would permit ceilings to be increased by an amount equal to the amount of direct cost increase occasioned by the wage rate increases.

We will also reflect in processor ceilings approved raw material increases such as those in the case of lima beans and cucumbers. In the case of the subsidized vegetables, subsidy payments will be reduced if processors pay less than the designated grower prices, and, on the unsubsidized portion of the pack, or if there are no subsidies, we will provide for a reduction of ceilings if processors pay less than the designated grower prices.

If subsidy is withdrawn, the program remains approximately the same, except that we will increase ceilings by the full amount of the subsidy expenditures involved. It should be noted, however, that that course presents some difficult technical problems in the

case of items like tomato products, where subsidized items are blended or processed with unsubsidized ingredients.

Whether subsidy is continued or withdrawn, we'll continue to make minor corrections, such as those made throughout last year, wherever such action will not affect the average price level significantly. Also, our individual adjustment provisions, which were liberalized and streamlined to some degree last year, will provide adjustment for those processors who can produce the necessary evidence.

In addition to these adjustment provisions, this year there will be another means of receiving individual adjustment. In September of 1945, OPA issued a regulation called Supplementary Order 133, the purpose of which is to authorize individual adjustments in the ceiling prices of products produced by manufacturers who would otherwise be compelled to conduct their entire operations at a loss. This so-called "bail-out" or "rescue" adjustment will be made applicable to our fruit and vegetable processor regulations in the near future, as a means of assisting in your industry's effective transition to peace-time operations. I'm not going to describe the workings of this kind of adjustment but, within certain limitations, it tries, where possible, to prevent overall company loss which may arise out of various causes. On that basis, it's about as far as we can go in attempting to cushion the impact of industry-wide price control on individual companies in varying situations.

Same Program for Canners

Briefly, then, this is what we have in mind for most of the fruit and vegetable processing industry, with particular reference to canners. Approximately the same plans will apply in the case of most other processors and I'll single out only the freezing and preserving portions of the industry for special attention.

As freezers perhaps will recall, we took the position last year that our ceilings were returning no more than the earnings standard required. Therefore, all measurable cost increases were reflected in connection with the somewhat tardy 1945 regulation. We are taking the same position this year, subject to the results of a study now being concluded, and will change that position only if the study warrants it.

As to preserves, it's only necessary to note that sugar cost increases have a more substantial impact than in other parts of the processing industry. Accordingly, we plan to reflect sugar increases in 1946, as mentioned previously, and we'll have to reach a decision as to any sugar adjustment in the 1945 regulation.

These conclusions, approved by the Stabilization Administrator, are based upon our observations of industry re-

sults in 1944, some knowledge of the pack in 1945, estimated requirements and goals in 1946, and the general feeling that foreseeable conditions justify the same kind of program as last year's. We believe this announcement will permit advance planning and contracting and that such a program will encourage desired production as much as it is possible to do so under our operating limitations.

Issuance of Ceilings

All of this leaves unmentioned the approximate time of issuance of our various ceilings. This year I'm not going to have to undertake personally the headaches of attempting to ride herd on the job of getting these prices out on time, a project which has been pretty much a failure since price control was first imposed. On the other hand, in view of this announcement of our plans, it appears we have a fairly good start and that, barring subsidy complications, it should be possible to do better this year than in any previous year. We won't have to do any additional range-pricing, our individual adjustment provisions won't demand so much attention, we'll not have to go through last year's reversal of our recommendations which, although it benefitted canners, certainly contributed substantially to delay, and, finally, we won't have quite so much revising and refining to do.

One or two points should be noted, however, and, since this is perhaps my last opportunity to mention them publicly, I'm going to take advantage of it. I've worked with our people, with some of you and with many food distributors for four years and I know something about the difficulties involved in getting these prices revised and issued each year. A comparative handful of OPA people are responsible for the entire job, and they're hemmed in on every side by perfectly proper and logical limitations of one kind or another. They're fine people and they've worked long, hard and conscientiously to make sense of a difficult job, but they don't profess to be geniuses.

They can't possibly clear these programs with other agencies, discuss them with consultants and advisory committees, handle correspondence and visits by the trade, attend meetings, run surveys, write the regulations and get them issued within nice deadlines—unless they get plenty of help. They just can't be spread that thin and the agency's personnel situation will get worse before it gets better. Even with all kinds of help, they'd have trouble staying on schedule.

Now it's easy to hand out advice and you haven't asked me for any—but I'm going to say what I have in mind anyway. There is a fine line of demarcation between accepting or fighting the decisions of an agency like OPA and recognizing that you can't have perfection. However, every time you

decide to fight, or to ask reconsideration, or for special meetings, or that your ceilings be held up for reexamination, as is frequently the case, you not only delay the issuance of your own prices but you hurt the entire industry by taking these few people off other equally important and scheduled work. The result is delay and more delay—and late regulations.

I don't advise you to stop defending your own position—when you've got a good case fight 'till the cows come home! I suggest only that you keep in mind that OPA people can't produce miracles—and that they have more to do than they could do if they were never delayed—with maximum help they can perhaps do the job a little better and a little sooner. At best, they can never produce perfect technical results because it is impossible to reflect fully the assorted opinions of a dozen groups, especially within those limitations I spoke of and under conditions of continuing pressure and emergency.

Finally, this is a big, complex industry and occasionally false starts, plain mistakes, or errors in judgment can't be avoided. Therefore, try to sort the wheat from the chaff and don't submerge them with each individual inequity or deviation from the ideal that comes to your attention—if the entire food industry were writing its own controls it couldn't avoid those situations nor could it do much about them. Under those circumstances your own interests would dictate concentration on the important issues.

With a little luck, this may well be the last pack you'll have to worry about price control-wise. I can guarantee that OPA is interested in seeing you make the transition properly—and the quicker the better, provided only that stabilization doesn't suffer. Give the agency the benefit of a reasonable approach, don't expect perfection and I think you'll emerge as an industry with a whole skin.

1946 Program for Processed Fruits and Vegetables—A Panel Discussion by USDA Officials

THIRD GENERAL SESSION

F. L. Southerland, Chief, Processed Products Standardization and Inspection Division

It is our sincere desire to be as helpful as possible to processors and other interested parties, by making the inspection service available to those who wish to use it voluntarily. It is our plan to maintain inspection laboratories in major areas of production and in large receiving markets where demands for the inspection service are sufficient to justify the maintenance of a laboratory.

The Department's continuous inspection program will be continued. This type of service will be extended to additional plants this year.

The Department has established standards for 85 different processed fruits and vegetables and fruit and vegetable products. We are working on standards for several additional products and are constantly studying the established standards with a view of improving them. We encourage and welcome constructive criticism and suggestions from the industry for the development and improvement of U. S. Standards. I can assure you that all of your suggestions are given careful consideration.

It might be helpful to you to have me outline briefly the chief differences between standards of identity and minimum standards of quality established by the Food and Drug Administration, and quality standards for processed fruits and vegetables established by the Department of Agriculture.

Standards of identity established by the Food and Drug Administration are mandatory. They define the product and govern ingredients that a product

may contain. Such standards have been established for several canned fruits and fruit products and for most canned vegetables and several vegetable products.

Minimum standards of quality established by that Administration are also mandatory. Any product shipped in interstate commerce which fails to meet the minimum standard for the product must be labeled or marked in the manner prescribed by the Food and Drug Administration regulations to indicate that the product is below standard in quality.

There are at present only five canned fruits and two canned vegetables for which minimum standards of quality have been established by the Food and Drug Administration. Those products are canned peaches, apricots, pears, cherries, fruit cocktail, tomatoes, and pens.

The standards for processed fruits and vegetables established by the Department of Agriculture are for voluntary use and are designed chiefly to assist the processor in controlling and improving quality, and to serve as a basis for sale transactions and for Government official certification purposes.

After the Food and Drug Administration establishes a minimum standard of quality for a product, the Department of Agriculture then bases its lowest grade for that product on the minimum standard set by the Food and Drug Administration. Quality above that minimum then is generally divided into Grade C or Standard, Grade A or Extra Standard or Choice, and Grade A or Fancy, depending on trade practice.

With a few exceptions the minimum quality of U. S. Grade C or U. S. Standard is equivalent to the Food and Drug Administration's minimum standard of quality for those seven products in which it has established such standards.

In my opinion it might be very helpful for processors to become fully familiar with the standards established by the two agencies, as this may help them to avoid legal difficulties and to improve the quality of these products.

Leonard S. Foss, Chief of the Vegetable Marketing Division

The expenditures for food are expected to reach a peak level of about 30.6 billion dollars in 1945 as compared with 30.4 billion dollars in 1944 and 19 billion dollars in 1941, the last year prior to the war. While the 1946 national income is expected to decline somewhat from the 1945 estimate, expenditures for food in 1946 are expected to remain at a relative high level and above prewar. Early estimates of commercial exports and requirements for government procurement by all agencies, while indicating a substantial reduction from 1945 are well above prewar levels.

In view of the continued active demand for the 1945 packs of processed vegetables and anticipated demand for the 1946 packs, the United States Department of Agriculture has announced suggested production goals for vegetables for processing at 95.7 percent of the 1945 planted acreages. In respect to tomatoes, an increase of 4 percent is indicated. Slight decreases are suggested for sweet corn and green peas. On a national basis a reduction of 25 percent in the planted acreage of snap beans for processing is recommended. In the other vegetables, only minor changes have been suggested, except in the case of beets a reduction of about 30 percent seems desirable.

In order that a production of vegetables for processing and processed vegetables may be forthcoming in 1946 to meet the anticipated demand the USDA has proposed a program designed to remove obstacles in maintaining production in 1946 at near the 1945 level.

Designated prices for vegetables for processing and processed vegetables will not be supported in 1946. Moreover, there will be no USDA certification program. Support operations were undertaken during the war to assure meeting government and essential civilian requirements and encourage maximum production by growers and processors.

While the removal of all controls has not appeared feasible for the 1946 program, some progress has been made to provide greater industry responsibility and freedom of action for handling such matters as negotiations between growers and processors. At

this time the quantity of processed vegetables expected to be needed for government procurement is such that food orders applicable to the 1946 packs of vegetables would not appear to be necessary.

M. McCown, Acting Chief of the Deciduous Fruit Section

1. Price Control—Although price control on fresh and processed fruit is primarily a responsibility of the OPA, the USDA has certain responsibilities in this connection, including recommendation of grower prices to be used in the computation of processors' ceilings, and approval of maximum price regulations.

Since the application of price control to fresh fruits and fruit products, actual prices received for these commodities have been generally at or near ceiling levels. The end of the war has resulted in a considerable increase in the available supply of processed fruits to civilians, but with inventory levels still relatively low, and apparently no substantial reduction in the amount of money that consumers are willing to spend for fruit products, at or near ceiling levels, therefore, it would seem likely to remain under 1946. Therefore, as far as possible, we will recommend various fruits under processors' ceilings. Such action as early as

2. War Food Orders—War Food

into specified channels of utilization and to provide supplies for purchase for use by government agencies. The level of probable procurement for government agencies in 1946 is now expected to be such that food orders applicable to fruits will not be necessary.

3. Support—The 1945 Procurement Guaranty Program was designed to support, through the processors, the prices to growers of certain fruits for canning. There was recognized a particular responsibility in this connection as a result of the setting aside of specific quantities of the packs for purchase by government agencies. No support program applicable to fruits for canning is anticipated in 1946.

4. Foreign Trade—While the domestic demand may be such as to absorb most of the 1946 pack of processed fruits, export markets are expected to assume increasingly greater importance in connection with the utilization of fruit crops in the future. Promotion of foreign movement of processed, as well as of fresh fruits, must be considered as one of the important marketing activities of the USDA. Industry particularly through the newly formed Horticultural Industry Advisory Committee on Foreign Trade, which USDA Committee held its first meeting in Washington, January 28-31, will render a valuable service since industry is expected to assume ever increasing responsibilities in connection with foreign trade as we move through reconversion.

Three of the major canned fruit commodities, peaches, pears and cocktail, have been placed on general license, and others will be so handled as conditions warrant.

Postwar Foreign Trade—A Challenge To American Enterprise

By Arthur Paul, Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce

FROM CONFERENCE

I am very appreciative of having this opportunity of participating in this conference and of meeting with you and with the leaders of your industry.

In reshaping the Department of Commerce to cope with postwar problems, we are trying hard to establish relationships that will enable us to be the channel through which business speaks to the Government. We in turn want to be in a position to interpret and discuss the policies of the Government with you.

In the field of foreign trade, we have plans under way to establish new and active trade advisory committees that will be representative of all types of business. We want broad geographical representation and we want to have people from all types and sizes of business on our committees. There will also be many

subcommittees to deal with specialized subjects. We hope thus to learn from business at first hand its thoughts on the pressing problems of international trade and if our national policy seems at times to cut across the interests of certain businesses, we want to be in a position to talk it out freely and frankly and to explain the reasons for such policies.

Although this is a special panel of your conference I am not going to speak today on the particular aspects of our foreign trade that pertain to your special problems. I should like to get into the details of your problems but I do not feel competent to deal with them other than in a very general way. However, I have with me several persons from the Department who can help me professionally with your questions so that I hope we can have an active discussion after I have finished.

I am going to confine my remarks to an outline of what we see ahead in the broad field of foreign trade. I

want to throw out some thoughts on what we should do about our foreign economic problems and to suggest that we have more to gain than to lose by fostering and promoting a more vigorous foreign trade than we have ever had in the past and by participating more fully in foreign economic developments.

Throughout the war, American goods accompanied the American Army to all quarters of the globe. We shipped under lend-lease to our fighting Allies vast quantities of articles manufactured in American plants. American merchandise was thus distributed and consumed in distant corners of the world. In some of these places, the use of manufactured goods had previously been confined to very small groups, in a few it had been unknown. The results, I think, will have a lasting and powerful effect on international trade.

Demand for American Goods

First, there has been created an unprecedented demand not only for American goods but for manufactured goods in general. Also, the idea of producing many types of articles locally has been implanted and, in many places, American management and American technicians were called on to help develop local production so that scarce shipping space could be conserved and the drain on our resources could be lessened. But even before the war, there had been evidences of a trend toward industrialization in many of the so-called backward countries. Here and there, farsighted entrepreneurs in those countries realized what could be gained by starting industries to process available raw materials or utilize local manpower. They saw the advantages of using the newest machinery and of operating on a fairly large scale instead of beginning with second-hand equipment in small, ill-housed sweat shops. These forward looking industrialists were aided by the development of light automatic machinery on which the periods of training are shorter and with which the cost of getting started is greatly reduced.

The war has given a great impetus to this desire in many lands to go forward with many new projects. The urge to industrialize is today so strong and so widespread that we may well see a development that can be as important in economic history as was the industrial revolution of the 19th century in Europe or as was our own great industrial development of the last two or three generations.

The United States has emerged from the war the most powerful nation of the world—militarily—politically—and in economic affairs. How we use this power will set the pattern of history for many decades to come. Shall we do our share of repairing the damage of the war? Shall we fit in with and

encourage the trend toward industrialization? Shall we lead the way toward stronger world organization, or go our own separate way and for temporary nationalistic reasons perform acts that will split the world in regional blocs and impede progress toward world government? As we set our course now, we shall reap the rewards of our actions for generations to come. The opportunity before us is breath-taking.

Historical analogies can be misleading but they also help in acquiring perspective. At the conclusion of the Napoleonic Wars, England faced a situation somewhat parallel to ours now. But the progress of technology has been such that our decisions today may be reflected in physical results much more rapidly than has ever been possible in the past. If, for example, we should decide that we want to expand the frontiers of our economic activities, to invest abroad and to trade freely with the other nations, the physical means of doing so quickly are at hand. Immense facilities for ocean and air transportation and for worldwide communication were developed during the war and were utilized by us and our Allies in distributing the vast flow of our production. The markets have been uncovered, the trade routes established.

There is also another great difference. We are relatively self-sufficient; we do not need to bring—as England did—large quantities of foodstuffs from abroad and our other raw material requirements are comparatively few. Therefore, active participation on our part in world trade is going to involve widening our sphere of unrestricted commerce to include areas outside our national boundaries and sharing in the industrialization of other countries.

The benefits of going in this direction seem very obvious. Our largest customers have always been the more industrialized countries. The trade per capita between the United States and Canada is far greater than that of the United States and Mexico. Carrying the analogy within our own borders we can point to the fact that the trade of Pennsylvania and Ohio is far in excess of that of Alabama and Mississippi—again on a per capita basis.

To broaden the sphere of our activity and to encourage industrialization abroad would, of course, cause certain dislocations. The development of industry in our southern states hurt many northern plants, but the general level of our production rose and the public welfare was enhanced. Any change in the pattern of our economy brings difficulties for some. The manufacture of automobiles hurt the carriage makers, but again the public benefited and the national economy was given one of its greatest single boosts.

It took the British a number of years to make their decisions after the Napoleonic Wars. But the fact that they

did go in for free trade and participation in world economy affected the history of the next hundred years and raised their own standards at the same time. I want again to warn against a literal application of historical analogy, but I believe we can benefit by keeping in the back of our minds the progress as well as the mistakes and abuses of that era. We have no territorial ambitions nor have we any urge for colonization. We have learned the falsity of exploitation at home and we have seen how good wages and decent hours make for better customers. If we invest capital abroad with an eye to the temporary advantages of excessively low labor costs rather than to the more farsighted objective of raising levels of production and living standards, the results as measured in net returns will be disappointing. The effect on our standing as a nation, the hidden asset the Government contributes to foreign trade, will be tragic. We have seen exploded the story of the so-called backward worker who, if his wages are increased above a subsistence level, is supposed not to be willing to work more than the few days a week necessary to keep body and soul together. That same story was told of the workers of our own southern states a generation ago and has been discredited by experience there is recent decades. It was again proved to be false throughout the world during the war. What we learned then was that people everywhere work to satisfy their desires, and these desires can be multiplied as fast as we can furnish goods and services to stimulate them.

Equalise Labor Standards

There is also the prospect of a strengthened International Labor Office which can do much to equalize labor standards throughout the world. As part of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations Organization, the ILO will be in a far stronger position to demand adherence to its findings. To the extent that these will raise living standards abroad, they will help provide the means to buy American goods.

We want full employment at home through full utilization of resources; and we want to see the fruits of our labor more evenly distributed within our country. But we also want world peace because no domestic solutions to our problems are worth anything without it. We have learned that economic dislocations, lack of equality of opportunity, pressures from depressed areas—all these lead to arbitrary acts by the nations of the world each trying to obtain temporary advantage over the others. These acts in the past have amounted to virtual economic warfare between nations in time of peace. When war breaks out, as it has twice in our lifetime, its destination is fearful. All the gains of exploitation and scheming are wiped

away overnight and a debt is piled up to hobble the generations to come.

It seems clear, therefore, that we should decide upon a course of action that will encourage world-wide economic development. To do so will be one of the most significant acts toward insuring peace. Furthermore, I believe it can be made clear that by so doing we can ease our immediate economic problems.

Surpluses for Foreign Trade

Many of our industries have been geared up during the war to a capacity that is well above any prospective domestic demand. In a number of instances, these plants manufacture the very merchandise that is most needed abroad. Railroad equipment, power equipment, communications equipment, machine tools and certain chemicals are all good examples of what I have in mind. Within another year we will have surplus capacity in many other lines. If our supply facilities and the foreign demand for these items can be brought together, the easing of re-conversion is obvious. Cutbacks of production in these industries if not cushioned by foreign orders will cause grave dislocations of employment and a few years from now could be sufficiently prevalent to aggravate other deflationary pressures that we see in the offing.

But interfering with the immediate starting of active trade with the rest of the world are our own domestic shortages which require us still to restrict exports and the shortage of dollars in many foreign lands which require them to ration exchange and thus limit imports. In addition there are still many controls and cumbersome regulations carried over from before the war which might be described as a lag from the sharp nationalistic competition of the thirties.

We are rapidly catching up on the domestic shortages. It is just a question of time—and not too long a time at that—before we will be looking for markets for many types of goods. But we must make some decisions and take some steps in connection with the shortage of dollars and the matter of controls and impediments to trade.

As things stand now, the only credit of substantial volume that is forthcoming is from the U. S. Government, but even after adding the British loan to what has been authorized for the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank, the amounts involved fall far short of meeting the potential demand. The amounts must be supplemented by private credit and investment if we are to capitalize on the tremendous demand and the trend toward industrialization that I have described. There are great pools of unused capital resources in the United States—some of it in our commercial banks, and some in reserves of industry. However, short or medium term

credit in substantial volume would certainly not be warranted, and could not be kept liquid, unless we are going to see in the near future a program of long-term foreign investment, including the furnishing of a considerable amount of equity capital for the financing of industrial and commercial projects abroad.

If we tackle this problem with half-way measures and too hesitantly, we may well expect defaults and the breaking up of the world into separate economic blocs. But with courage and imagination, we could lead the way toward an expanded world trade that would be sound financially and that could make a great difference to us here by tipping the scales toward full utilization of our resources and full employment in the years just ahead, which are causing many of us much concern.

In connection with the difficulties of doing business abroad and the Government impediments to the carrying on of active world trade, I should like to discuss the use of the United Nations Organization as the means by which we shall try to extricate foreign trade from the tight strait-jacket of control in which it now finds itself. There have been proposed five specialized economic agencies which will have a bearing on trade and all of which are to be part of the Economic and Social Council of the UNO. These are the International Trade Organization, the International Bank, the Stabilization Fund, the International Labor Organization, and the Food and Agriculture Organization.

The nature and the proposed functions of the International Trade Organization were made public along with the terms of the British loan. Briefly the organization is set up for the purpose of formulating a general set of rules under which all member nations will agree to conduct their trade with each other. It is hoped, and expected, that as nations join the ITO, they will substitute multilateral discussion and agreement for arbitrary unilateral actions, by which nations in the past sought to achieve temporary positions of advantage over their neighbors. Such measures have always brought retaliation and subsequently lessened trade all around.

The ITO will also tackle through the proposed International Commodity Commissions the problems associated with great world trade commodities—rubber, tin, cotton, wheat, sugar and others. Here again it is hoped, and expected, that the advantages, direct and indirect, of membership in the ITO will be such that all important nations will join and that they will adhere to the commitments involved in membership. The advantages will not be confined to reduction in tariffs but will include as well access to the Fund and the Bank, as well as sharing in the good will which will emanate from general good standing in the family of the United Nations.

The United Kingdom has, as part of the proposed loan agreement, sponsored the International Trade Organization jointly with the United States. A group of fourteen nations have been invited to negotiate during the next three or four months trade agreements with us and among themselves. In this way, much ground work will be achieved preparatory to this summer's world trade conference at which the International Trade Organization will be formally proposed to the members of the UNO. This nuclear group of nations includes Belgium-Luxembourg, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Holland, India, New Zealand, South Africa, USSR, and the United Kingdom.

United Nations Charter

The extent to which the Congress of the United States has already endorsed the program is not fully realized by many persons. In ratifying the San Francisco Charter of the United Nations, the Senate gave its approval to Chapter IX—International Economic and Social Cooperation, whose purpose is stated in Article 55 as follows:

"With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

(a) Higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

(b) solutions of international economic, social, health and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation; and

(c) universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language or religion."

This Article also provides that all members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the United Nations for the achievement of the purposes just quoted. The various specialized agencies established by inter-governmental agreement and having wide international responsibilities, as defined in their basic instruments, in economic, social, cultural, educational, health and related fields, shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations in the Economic and Social Council.

Again, in passing the Bretton Woods legislation the Congress stated as follows:

"In the realization that additional measures of international economic cooperation are necessary to facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade and render most effective the operations of the Fund and the Bank, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to seek to bring about further agreement and cooperation among nations and international bodies, as soon as possi-

ble, on ways and means which will best reduce obstacles to and restrictions upon international trade, eliminate unfair trade practices, promote mutually advantageous commercial relations, and otherwise facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade and promote the stability of international economic relations. In considering the policies of the United States in foreign lending and the policies of the Fund and the Bank, particularly in conducting exchange transactions, the Council and the United States representatives on the Fund and the Bank shall give careful consideration to the progress which has been made in achieving such agreement and cooperation."

Although our participation in the International Trade Organization will of course have to be specifically approved by Congress after this summer's conference, I believe the executive branch of the Government is by these Congressional expressions under a mandate to sponsor such an organization and to negotiate with other countries for its adoption.

I further believe that the public of the United States is, if anything, a bit ahead of the Congress and the Administration in its demand that we move ahead with the establishment and the strengthening of these organizations

tions and all other parts of the United Nations Organization. I think this is true of peoples throughout the world. I do not think that any official group opposing adherence to the UNO and its subsidiaries could long retain power in any country of the world. The mandate to move ahead on this front from the people is becoming clearer every day.

Finally, I should like to point out that if the trend toward industrialization of undeveloped lands is carried on under the aegis of the ITO and a strengthened ILO, then these world developments can be carried out in an orderly way, in a way that will raise standards of living throughout the world and can promote world trade generally.

In my opinion the most constructive way of promoting our commerce today is for the United States—and we are well able to do so—to take the lead in promoting the trade of the world by assisting and fostering the trend toward world industrialization, by encouraging the enlightened use of a liberal international credit policy, by practicing a decent and cooperative trade policy and insisting that others do likewise and by seeing that the new international organizations are strong and that they really work.

Report on Legislation Affecting the Fisheries

By H. Thomas Austern of the Office of Association Counsel

FISH CANNERS CONFERENCE

In reporting to you briefly this afternoon on legislative developments affecting the fisheries, it is perhaps best to deal first with pending Congressional legislation, and next to discuss very briefly some administrative action which is being sought to be carried on under legislation already enacted. In following legislation affecting the fisheries we are required first to examine legislation which is of general character and had an impact on the fisheries industry only insofar as it has impact upon the economy as a whole.

The first of these, and one which is awaiting Congressional implementation, is the Presidential announcement of a new fisheries policy, announced by President Truman on September 28, 1945, in Proclamation 2668. In substance, this Proclamation recognized the interests of the United States in its coastal fisheries beyond the three-mile limit. I am sure that Dr. Ira Gabrielson of U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, could tell us many of the current facts underlying the need for conservation in ocean fisheries beyond the three-mile limit.

President Truman's Proclamation asserts this:

"The Government of the United States regards it as proper to establish conservation zones in those areas

of the high seas contiguous to the coasts of the United States where fishing activities have been or in the future may be developed and maintained."

The Proclamation goes on to assert that where a fishery has been developed by American nationals alone our Government will regard it as proper to establish explicitly bounded conservation zones in which fishing activities should be subject to regulation by the United States alone; where a fishery has been legitimately developed by the nationals of this country and those of other countries we are to make agreements with such other States to provide for the conservation of such fisheries. It is significant that the word "legitimately" is used in that Presidential proclamation in view of the historical controversy concerned with Japanese fishing in Alaska.

Undoubtedly in future legislation these principles will be implemented by Congress and in this fashion protection will be accorded to these vital off-shore fisheries. In the meantime, the President has requested the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of State to make recommendations for the establishment of fishery conservation zones in these ocean waters.

In this same connection you may recall that during the past year the National Canners Association has been instrumental in developing with the State Department an effective liaison to provide that on appropriate subjects

the members of this industry may directly convey their views to the State Department.

It is also gratifying to note the newly awakened Congressional interest in the fisheries. This has led to the introduction of various Congressional proposals to investigate important American fisheries: H. R. 323 on authorizing investigation of the Hawaiian fisheries, House Resolution 135 of the North Atlantic fisheries, House Resolution 116 of the Great Lakes fisheries; and Senate Resolution 180 of the Columbia River fisheries.

If Dr. Gabrielson will forgive me for mentioning this, I would like to say we also hope that necessary increased appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service will be granted by the Congress so as to permit that agency even more adequately to perform its important conservation functions.

Happily, gentlemen, there seems to be a growing awareness in Congress—undoubtedly engendered by the splendid job which the fisheries industry did during the war—a realization of the importance of sound conservation and intelligent commercial exploitation of these important resources.

In passing I might also mention that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last year reported S. 1206. This bill would have the effect of requiring the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture for any price regulation for any food or feed product processed in whole or in part from fish. This would put fish on precisely the same basis as agricultural commodities and products so far as price control is concerned. A companion bill, H. R. 3858, is pending in the House.

Generally speaking, of perhaps major interest to the fisheries industry at this time is the pending Pepper bill. You will remember that in the Fair Labor Standards Act as originally enacted subsection (5) of Section 13 provided a complete exemption for all employees engaged in processing fish, and specifically included canning and freezing and the distribution of canned and frozen fishery products. In 1941 the Wage and Hour Division issued interpretative Bulletin No. 12 which rather rigidly narrowed that exemption. In the intervening years the Industry and the Labor Department have had quite a vigorous contest about that interpretation.

Last March by way of a press release the Labor Department announced a new and somewhat different interpretation of the exemption. The National Canners Association, on behalf of the fish canners, prevailed upon the Administrator to defer the issuance of this new regulation until the application of the exemption to the industry could be fully and intelligently explored. As a result, the Department of Labor, as you know, has held hearings at many points along the Pacific Coast and on the Gulf and the recommendations from the field have gone forward

to the Wage and Hour Administrator. As yet he has not acted.

In the meantime the Pepper bill, S. 2182, was introduced last July. This would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act and would limit the fisheries' exemption solely to employees catching or taking fish; no employees engaged in canning or in other processing would continue to be exempt. Extensive hearings have been held, many organizations have filed briefs, and virtually all segments of the fisheries industry have protested this change.

I don't suppose I have to tell you that with respect to minimum wages the Pepper bill is of great interest to the cannery industry as a whole. It has been reported that the minimum wage will be raised either to 55 or 65 cents an hour, and later to 75 cents an hour. Whether these reports are correct we will probably know at the end of the week.

Details in Information Letter

Necessarily the fisheries industry is also interested in the various proposals for the control of water pollution, both of streams and of ocean tributaries. These measures are also fully reviewed in the INFORMATION LETTER and in the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Association. I might add, however, that the Bailey bill, H. R. 3972, if enacted, will permit the deduction for income tax purposes, as an expense, of all funds spent for water control to prevent water pollution, and this bill is expected to prove helpful in advancing this important program. The Bailey bill, along with all these other measures, is being actively followed by the Committee on Legislation of the National Canners Association.

We may turn briefly to the proposed administrative action. The first which warrants mention is the proceeding of the Department of the Interior concerning Indian claims in Alaska.

Several Indian groups assert that they have the exclusive possessory right to vast areas of land and water in Alaska. These native claims are based on the ground that the ancestors of these Indians aboriginally possessed these lands and ocean waters. The Indians also say that nothing that has happened since the beginning of the nineteenth century has in any way destroyed their possessory rights.

The power of the Secretary of the Interior to deal administratively with these claims is denied by the fisheries industry—I might add, by many other Alaskan industries. The Department began the proceeding under the White Act, which, as many of you know, is a fishery conservation statute which expressly provides equal fishing rights for Indians and non-Indians alike.

I must confess that the theory on which the Department is now proceeding has a great many of us baffled. At any event, the Department has held extensive hearings. To preside at these

hearings the Secretary appointed Judge Richard H. Hanna of New Mexico and widely publicized his reputation for fairness and his knowledge of Indian affairs. On the basis of the record, which the Department said was to be the sole official record, Judge Hanna found that the Indian claims were not supported by the evidence.

After that, a final order was issued which was said to be based on Judge Hanna's findings; but, nevertheless, the Secretary of the Interior has purported to recognize exclusive possessory rights to 273,000 acres of Alaskan lands and waters. I won't go into the reasons why. I might say that no cannery and no trap site is now included in any grant. However, the practical impact of this attempted administrative action upon the Fisher-Industry in Alaska is very difficult to determine. It may be that that controversy will be solved only by Congressional action.

I might say further that to a lawyer this administrative proceeding concerning the Fisheries and these Indians of Alaska is very puzzling. The Secretary of the Interior has said that no non-Indian may hereafter enter upon these lands because the Indians still possess them even though they don't occupy them. On the other hand, he has not given the land to the Indians; it is still in the public domain. It is

a wonderful jigsaw puzzle as far as a lawyer is concerned; but, fortunately, it has not interfered with the catching or processing of fish to date.

I might also mention, and conclude with, the announcement which appeared in the February 2 *Register* of a hearing to be held on February 21 further to amend the Alaskan fishery regulations. This proposes the addition to the fishery regulations of a rule that would limit the number of traps which might be operated by any person or corporation to twenty traps. It also contemplates that future regulations will limit the number of traps progressively over five years so that no person or company may at any time have more than ten. It also provides for priorities, and one of the proposals is that residents of Alaska shall have priority over non-residents of Alaska.

Since this entire question is to be the subject of a public hearing I shall not presume to discuss the legal issues as to whether there is authority or lack of authority for the action. Yet it should interest every man in the room—salmon canner, salmon fisheries operator, or any other—to observe the principle embodied in that type of proposed administrative action; namely, that the operations of any individual or any company in terms of total "take" or total pack may be regulated and limited by administrative action.

Why I Don't Serve Canned Fish More Often

By Barbara Daly Anderson, Director, Parents' Magazine Consumer Service Bureau

FISH CANNERS CONFERENCE

Some 1,200 homemakers are speaking to you today. I'm simply their deputy. Because it's so easy to generalize and present subjective opinions which do not represent a cross-section of consumer thinking, my answer to the subject assigned: "Why I Don't Serve Canned Fish More Often," represents a composite of views from two principal sources.

First, I'm going to present the views of 1,200 consumers who answered a questionnaire built around today's subject. And second, I bring you also, the considered opinions of outstanding home economists, foods writers, and editors whose job it is to be in constant touch with consumer buying habits in the foods field.

Answers to the survey came from 1,200 Parents' Magazine readers—mothers of children—living in almost every state of the union, and who comprise part of a Consumer Information Panel of 2,500. Their average incomes now range close to the \$3,500 mark, somewhat above national average income—a good cross-section of your buying public for whom even some of the more expensive varieties of canned fish are

not necessarily luxuries—in normal times. But that last qualifying phrase, "in normal times," tempers the approach one must make to a proper evaluation of any consumer poll on canned fish at the present time. During the war, diversion to the Armed Forces of such a high percentage of the nation's pack, confiscation of fishing boats, curtailment of the use of fishing grounds, pricing difficulties, and lack of skilled labor have obviously created shortages of which the majority of consumers are aware.

As you well know, average per capita consumption of fish of all kinds has retrogressed and, no doubt, for the above mentioned reasons. Average total consumption for the years 1935 to 1939 was 12.8 lbs. per person for all types of fish consumed. In 1945 that figure had dropped to 10.9 lbs., and 3.5 lbs. of this represented average per capita consumption of canned fish. A great many people have assumed that fish consumption has gone up since the war. *Parents' Magazine's* consumer poll confirms these per capita consumption figures at least in relation to canned fish. Only 10 percent of 1,200 women polled said that they served canned fish more frequently now than they did before the war. They gave as their principal reasons, in this order of numerical mention: "Because the family has grown to like it"; "because

meat is hard to get," "more economical than meat."

But we'll attempt today to take the long-range point of view. Canned fish has been, and still is, by and large an emergency shelf item. How are we going to dust off those occasional-use cans and move them up into the front ranks of meal planning? I think my consumer adviser and foods editor panels have some of the answers.

Survey Results

Let's see what percentage of the 1,200 consumers surveyed like canned fish. At first reading results look mighty cheerful. In the survey we differentiated between "Canned Fish" and "Canned Seafood" and recorded the likes and dislikes of adults and children.

Ninety percent of the adults said they liked canned fish in some form.

Seventy-Two percent of the adults liked canned seafood in some form.

Eighty-One percent of children under 5 yrs. like canned fish in some form.

Forty percent of children under 5 yrs. liked canned seafood.

Eighty-Six percent of children over 5 yrs. liked canned fish.

Fifty-Five percent of children over 5 yrs. like canned seafood.

However, when, in a succeeding question, consumers were asked the direct question—why they did not serve canned fish more often, 43 percent of them gave as their answer that at least one member of the family disliked canned fish or canned seafood. And more often than not as *Parents' Magazine* found in its survey, it was the husband who disliked canned fish. That figure tops by 20 percent the results of a 1942 *Woman's Home Companion* survey to their reader editors. Miss Dorothy Kirk, Foods Editor, tells me that 20 percent of some 1,000 reader-editors when polled said that they didn't serve fish because their families didn't like it.

Comments in the *Parents' Magazine* survey ran like a refrain and in some instances, a dirge:

"My husband doesn't like canned fish."

"I love it but—my husband doesn't like canned fish."

"My husband doesn't like creamed dishes and how else is one to serve canned fish?"

"How can you expect a man born in the Middle West and raised on a meat and potato diet to be satisfied with creamed salmon!"

Maybe some smart packer will come out with a group of canned fish recipes approved by an All-Male Jury! Maybe that's where we magazine people have missed a bet. Try 'em on the menfolks first and the women shoppers will be the first to respond. Even some of us

home economists who are supposed to know how to cook, can't get our husbands to like canned fish. Miss Helen Ridley, of J. Walter Thompson Agency, admits that canned salmon, for instance, has been anathema to her husband ever since the last war. He still calls it "gold fish." Maybe his case is exceptional, but Miss Ridley declares, "I still think women serve what their husbands like." Miss Ridley also thinks that canners should tell consumers how to handle canned fish after opening, for a quality pack can be ruined by ignorance. She would have you include some simple instructions on the label or accompanying booklet, as follows:

"Open can, turn on plate to let oil drain off, remove center bone (if salmon) and outside grey skin, disturbing the fillet (or flakes) as little as possible."

Ways of serving canned fish fell into four principal categories: Creamed, scalloped, sandwiches, and salads; the latter chiefly in summertime. Yet consumers expressed in no uncertain terms the desire for more recipes. From a town in New York State came this typical comment:

"I really don't know how to serve canned fish and seafood to make appetizing dishes. If I did, I'd probably use it more often."

And from Rochester, New York:

"If the dealers would print recipes and uses for fish on the outside of the can, I would try them more often. Who wants to buy canned food and have it stand on the pantry shelf because they don't know how to use it?"

And from Marquette, Michigan:

"I believe there should be more advertisements which include recipes for use of fish and seafood."

A woman from Niagara Falls, New York, said she'd just never gotten in the habit of serving fish more often—no inducement. But, she said, "I once found a recipe put out by Kraft Cheese Co., called 'Kraft's Cheese Delight' and I serve this quite often."

Another woman from Chilton, Texas, sent in a recipe for "Red Salmon Souffle" which she'd cut out of an ad. She said "it was as delicious as the ad was appetizing." While from Williamsburg, Mass., comes the same old plea—"more recipes for the use of seafood and canned fish—without a cream sauce base."

Some of the foods editors whom I consulted reflect similar opinions from their readers. Miss Esther Kimmel, Director of Home Economics for McFadden Publications, says: "For *True Story* and McFadden Group readers, more recipes—appetizing, hearty, pretty—but not too fancy—just good to eat and easy to prepare."

A *Parents' Magazine* reader from Pennsylvania says the same thing in a different way. She sent in a copy

of a Gorton's fish cake advertisement—Codfish Balls arranged on a plate with lemon and parsley garnish, asparagus tips and diced carrots. Says she: "It appealed to me because it's a good hurry-up dinner and so extremely easy to prepare, even the children could do it."

And a woman from Hickory, North Carolina, commented: "I suppose I don't serve canned fish more often because I've not been introduced to it. Ads with recipes would undoubtedly catch my attention."

Miss Gertrude Lynn, home economics consultant, says:

"Homemakers are always on the hunt for new, delicious recipes. They must be simple and easy to serve and dramatized in color illustrations for advertising and dealer store posters. Why not a 'Canned Fish Month' and each week during the month feature a specific variety of canned fish in grocery stores with give-away copies of the recipes?"

As for advertising in general, the consumer panel of 1,200 homemakers offered illuminating comments. We asked the question:

"Can you recall with pleasure or real interest, any advertisement of canned fish?"

Of 1,211 who replied only 20 percent or 252 could recall, with any accuracy, any advertisement at all for canned fish. Of these, almost 50 percent named advertisements of Van Camp Seafood Co. The honors apparently go to Van Camp for a continuing presentation of their wares. Many who mentioned Van Camp, referred to their very valuable trade mark, "Chicken of the Sea." As a woman from Roxbury, Mass., put it: "Chicken of the Sea Tuna ads stick in my mind. I don't know just why. I think the name itself is attractive, and suggests a delicacy."

Ads with Children Attract

Other consumers said they were always attracted to ads with children in them, consequently the Van Camp Seafood ad headed "Junior Hostess" with a little girl serving tuna sandwiches, caught their fancy. Many mentioned, also, Van Camp's fishing fleet ads. As one Massachusetts woman put it: "Those fishing trawlers are much larger and different from what I'd imagined."

Gorton's, Forty Fathom, and Bumble Bee Brand Salmon advertisements were referred to several times. But the majority of consumers could not be specific and recorded only the beautiful memory of, for instance:

"A platter of pink salmon surrounded by watercress" from Virginia.

"A crabmeat salad with ripe olives, in color"—Illinois.

"A 'tuna scallop' made my mouth water"—Maine.

And from Louisville, Ky., comes this comment: "In advertising I like pictures of finished dishes and plate arrangements with simple recipes. I like to think of the original scaly state as little as possible."

That last comment raises the point: How are you packers to inject appetite appeal pictorially into canned fish labels when the law requires you to depict the food on the can exactly as it appears. For that's almost what it amounts to. You are prohibited from indicating to the consumer that there is something in the can which is not there. It's true, of course, that the Food and Drug Administration permits "pictorial representation of foods associated with the sources or uses of the food" (I'm quoting now, from the National Canners' Manual for Canned Food Labels). For instance, red tart pitted cherries get off to a good head start in the picture of red cherry pie and there's even a recipe on the label to tell you how to make it. No fooling about those cherries—they look what they are, red, juicy cherries good enough to eat off the label.

Attractive Labels Help

Attractive labels can also do much to educate consumers away from the notion that there's something inherently objectionable about canned fish. *Parents' Magazine* Consumer Panel members registered strong objections to the fishy odor associated with the handling of fish—whether fresh or canned. Perhaps they need to be told more often about that little trick of rubbing hands and fishy dishes with moistened salt and rinsing before putting them in the dish pan. Perhaps the characteristic fishy odor is not the hurdle we think it is, once appetite for the finished product has been aroused.

Odor being so closely related to taste, physiologically, it was apparent from consumer comments in the survey, that many confused odor with taste and really disliked the taste of the oils in which certain types of fish are packed. Miss Gertrude Betten of Sealtest Laboratory Kitchens told me of consumer complaints that had come to her of the unpleasant after-taste of certain canned fish. Granting that the supply of oils has presented a problem during the war, it still seems evident that there's room for improvement either in the choice of oils used or in their refining—to remove as much of the strong, objectionable taste as possible.

Appearance of the pack ranks high in consumer favor or prejudice. "Why," said a consumer from Woburn, Mass., "need canned fish be so tiresome to clean? And how about a canned crabmeat that's boneless and doesn't have to be shredded, and a canned salmon with no bones at all?" Miss Katharine Fisher, Director of Good Housekeeping Institute, is also hopeful that something can be done about canned shrimp.

Miss Fisher says, "We do wish that shrimp could have the vein removed before canning. Doing this with canned shrimp so often breaks up the shrimp, and it isn't a pleasant task to remove that vein. Also, in some packs of salmon the appearance is not very appetizing because of the skin and bones which are left in the pack."

Home Economist Miss Bernice Burns of the Kenyon Eckhardt Advertising Agency reported having received consumer complaints that "canned fish is generally over-cooked; it falls to pieces or is shapeless." Processing temperatures being unyielding things, it's hard to get around that. But perhaps there's room for further exploration to reduce the amount of moisture in certain packs.

That old problem of number and variety of can sizes bobbed up frequently on the questionnaire. Said a woman from Iowa: "I make sandwiches for the children's lunch boxes and have fish left over which I usually throw away." Whereas others complained that canned fish should be packed in larger sizes. Miss Eleonora Sense, co-editor of *Forecast Magazine*, felt that this problem could be partly solved by suggesting more uses for left-overs. Sealtest Kitchen Laboratories home economists thought that can sizes were about right, but that decided improvement could be made in grocery store displays.

Current scarcity of well-known brands, of course, has many consumers bothered. A woman from Columbus, Nebraska, wrote "I would serve canned fish more often if I could find the kinds we like on the grocer's shelves. We are particular about brands and types." Another consumer from Decatur, Illinois, wrote, "I'd buy more canned fish if I could find the brands I'm familiar with and know are good. Fish to us must be so carefully handled and so clean that I hesitate to buy a brand I don't know." Scarcity has something to do with decreased buymanship, but perhaps grocery store merchandising needs to be stepped up too.

There is a definite need to educate consumers to the fact that canned fish (excepting luxury packs) need not be any more expensive than meat. Miss Blanche Stover, Editor of *Practical Home Economics*, says, "Does the average consumer hesitate to pay 80 cents for four lamb chops, yet considers two cans of fish at 39 cents each, an extravagance, when actually she's getting equivalent protein value at the same price?" And Miss Grace White, Home Economist for Barton, Batten, Durstine Osborne Agency says, in this connection: "Few may know that canned mackerel may be had in the form of four tasty fillets for as little as 15 cents." And she goes on to say, "Most consumers consider canned fish a luxury, emergency shelf product to be tapped only on special occasions." Again, there are others, like my consumer adviser from Richmond, Virginia, who said, "In our family we

don't consider canned fish a 'company dish.'"

Edith Barber, Foods Editor of *The New York Sun*, says: "Salmon and tuna have been made popular by advertising, why not such items as smoked shad and mackerel?"

Mabel Stegner, home economics consultant, thinks Armour and Co. is a good example of a company that increased the popularity of the less popular meat sundries by injecting appetite appeal and including recipes, menus and party suggestions in their wartime advertising. The same can be done, she thinks, for the less popular varieties of canned fish.

Summary

I've told you what prominent home economists and foods editors say can be done to increase the consumption of canned fish. Now let's see how a final summing up of consumer opinion reads. In answer to the question, "Why I Don't Serve Canned Fish More Often," the 1,200 consumers polled gave their reasons as follows:

Forty-three percent—because my family doesn't care for it more often.

Thirty-four percent—because canned fish is hard to get.

Sixteen percent—too expensive.

Four percent—not enough interesting ways to cook fish.

Two percent—poor quality prevents buying more often.

Assuming that distribution will straighten out within the next year, and ruling out 35 percent to 40 percent who definitely won't be persuaded, no matter what you do, to serve canned fish more frequently, we still have a good 60 percent of the population who constitute a potential buying market. How to tap that market?

Opinions and suggestions from *Parents' Magazine*'s Consumer Panel and from the food experts quoted herein, summarize pretty much as follows—and in this order of importance:

1. More recipes and menus—on labels, in recipe booklets, and in advertising.
2. More dramatic advertising, with color and appetite appeal.
3. Education of the consumer on the economic value of fish as a protein food as compared with other protein foods.
4. Education of the consumer on the proper handling of fish—after the can is opened.
5. In general, improvement of the quality of some types of canned fish—less watery packs, milder flavored oils, removal of extra-neous viscera.
6. And this depends upon the success of the other five objectives: Be-guile more husbands into liking canned fish!

The FAO and Its Effect on the American Fisheries

By A. W. Anderson,* Chief, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Fish and Wildlife Service

FISH CANNERS CONFERENCE

FAO means Food and Agriculture Organization. It is one of the recently established international alphabetical organizations. It is closely allied to but completely separate from UNO. UNO was established to preserve world security whereas FAO, as its name indicates, is concerned with food and agriculture. The activities of FAO, UNO and other international organizations that have been or will be created are coordinated by the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations.

FAO was actually established as the first of the permanent United Nations organizations last October in Quebec. However, it really began with the extension of an invitation by the United States Government to a number of the United Nations to be represented at a United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture at Hot Springs, Virginia, in May, 1943. As a result of the deliberations of this Conference a United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture was established to carry out the recommendations of the Conference, including the formulation of a specific plan for a permanent organization in the field of food and agriculture. Although the war was in progress the Interim Commission carried on the duties delegated to it to good effect. A number of Technical Committees were established, including one on Fisheries. This Committee was charged with preparing comprehensive background material on fisheries and making recommendations regarding the future fisheries work of the permanent organization. Members of the Committee included representatives from Canada, Iceland, Newfoundland, Norway and the United States. The result of their efforts was a 35-page printed report on the fisheries of the world including a series of recommendations.

The formal convening of the first session of FAO as a permanent organization occurred in Quebec on October 16 when the constitution was signed by delegates from 30 of the nations present at Hot Springs. Before the concluding session 12 more nations had signed, making a total of 42 full members. Argentina, the U.S.S.R., the Byelorussian SSR, and the Ukrainian SSR attended only as observers. The U.S.S.R. observer indicated that the U.S.S.R. favored international cooperation with respect to food and agriculture problems but stated that the organization of the FAO required further study and that the constituent republics of the U.S.S.R. having important agricultural interests had to be con-

sulted. For these reasons the U.S.S.R. did not sign the constitution at Quebec.

Before endeavoring to outline the probable effect that FAO may have on our American fisheries it is necessary to examine the organization more closely and to consider its proposed program.

The purposes for which FAO was established are outlined in its constitution as follows:

Raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions, securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products, bettering the condition of rural populations, and thus contributing toward an expanding world economy.

Briefly, the functions of FAO involve the collection and dissemination of information, the promotion and recommendation of national and international action, and the furnishing of such assistance and the organization of such missions as may be requested. The specific functions, as listed in the constitution are:

1. The Organization shall collect, analyze, interpret, and disseminate information relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture.

2. The Organization shall promote and, where appropriate, shall recommend national and international action with respect to

(a) Scientific, technological, social, and economic research relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture;

(b) the improvement of education and administration relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture, and the spread of public knowledge of nutritional and agricultural science and practice;

(c) the conservation of natural resources and the adoption of improved methods of agricultural production;

(d) the improvement of processing, marketing, and distribution of food and agricultural products;

(e) the adoption of policies for the provision of adequate agricultural credit, national and international;

(f) the adoption of international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements.

3. It shall also be the function of the Organization

(a) To furnish such technical assistance as governments may request;

(b) to organize, in cooperation with the governments concerned, such missions as may be needed to assist them to fulfill obligations arising from their acceptance of the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture; and

(c) generally to take all necessary and appropriate action to implement

the purposes of the Organization as set forth in the Preamble.

After the formal organization of FAO in Quebec the development of its future program was turned over to 6 main committees. These committees were: Nutrition and Food Management, Agriculture, Forestry and Forest Products, Fisheries, Marketing, and Statistics. With the exception of the Agriculture and Forestry Committees each Committee was concerned with some aspect of the world's fisheries.

The Fisheries Committee was made up of delegates or advisers from 23 nations under the chairmanship of the Icelandic Minister to the United States. This Committee used as a basis for its discussion the technical report of the Interim Commission Committee on Fisheries. Eventually some recommendations were revised and others added. Finally, 8 proposals were submitted to the Conference of Member nations, the policy making body of FAO, and accepted as an outline of its future fisheries program.

Fisheries Information

The first proposal was concerned with the collection and dissemination of fisheries information. Under this FAO will encourage the exchange of fisheries publications between various countries; publish a classified catalog of fishery data; encourage the printing of summarized fishery data; foster the collection and publication of basic data by Member nations; arrange for the early publication of recommended names and synonyms for economically important fish; and arrange a conference to promote more uniform methods of collecting and reporting statistical data.

The second proposal concerned various fields of fishery research. With respect to biological and hydrographical research FAO will encourage the resumption of suspended activities, emphasize the need for continuous investigations, urge cooperation in research where the same resource is involved, stimulate the provision of better research facilities, and encourage the exchange of students and research workers.

With respect to nutritional and pharmacological research FAO will encourage the use of nutritional data to popularize fish as an excellent source of protein, minerals and certain of the essential vitamins; encourage studies to increase the consumption of fish, particularly where the present diet is largely cereals and pulses; foster the exchange of information on the best means of preparing fish for culinary purposes; and encourage the development of pharmacological products to diversify the uses for fishery products.

With respect to technological research FAO will direct its efforts toward securing the adoption of improved methods which, in large part,

*Fishery Adviser at Quebec to U. S. member of FAO.

are now available, and will sponsor international conferences of fishery technologists.

With respect to research institutions FAO will cooperate with government or private agencies to encourage further development of existing centers and establishment of new centers to serve as focal points for fishery exploratory work, and for demonstrating new techniques of producing, processing and marketing.

Economic Research

With respect to sociological and economic research FAO will cooperate with international agencies in initiating studies on the relation of fishery methods to production and employment, well-being and public health, and occupational hazards and diseases, and will encourage economic studies concerned with collective bargaining, labor exchange, social security, insurance laws, credit unions and cooperatives.

The third proposal involved the improvement of fishery education and the spread of knowledge of fishery science and practice. In this connection FAO will encourage the establishment of fishery schools and fishery courses at suitable institutions.

The fourth proposal was concerned with the conservation and development of fishery resources. With respect to conservation FAO will stimulate research in this field, encourage international cooperation, coordinate the activities of international bodies, arrange periodic conferences, and support international research and regulatory programs.

With respect to the full use of resources FAO will encourage practical demonstrations of modern fishing vessels and gear and encourage the exchange of information on advanced design.

FAO also will encourage the adoption of suitable techniques of fish culture wherever propagation of fish is practicable.

The fifth proposal covered the improvement of the processing, marketing, and distribution of fishery products. Since a wealth of information is available on processing FAO will encourage the assembling of this information in usable form for dissemination. With respect to marketing and distribution FAO will encourage the extension of studies designed to insure wholesome standardized products which will be within the reach of low-income consumers.

The sixth proposal involved the provision of adequate national and international fishery credits. FAO will encourage governments to grant credits where needed, give advice when required, and extend to fisheries, if such international credits are made available, the steps contemplated for agriculture.

The seventh proposal was concerned with the adoption of international policies regarding commodity arrangements for fishery products. Since commodity arrangements can be applied to non-perishable fishery products FAO will study commodity arrangements, especially as they hinder or promote production and distribution, study the effects of tariffs, exchange rates and other barriers which restrict fishery trade, and supply this information to interested authorities.

The eighth and final proposal recommended that FAO appoint an advisory committee on fisheries because it was believed the Director-General and his deputies would benefit from consultation with such a group, particularly during the initial stages of organization.

FAO has not put any part of its fisheries program into effect and will not be able to do so until its organization has been completed. FAO's policies are made by the Conference which meets annually. In the interim an Executive Committee is empowered to act. The policies and programs are carried out by a Director-General assisted by an international technical staff and advisory committees. The Director-General was appointed at Quebec. He is Sir John Orr, Director of the Rowett Institute in Aberdeen, Scotland, and a world famed nutritionist. He resigned as a Member of the House of Commons for the University of Glasgow in order to assume his new work. He will be assisted by several Deputy Director-Generals and 8 Division Chiefs. The Division Chiefs will have direct supervision of individual activities such as fisheries, forestry, agriculture, marketing, statistics, and so forth. The Division Chief to head the fisheries work has not been chosen and presumably will not be named until after the Executive Committee meets in March. Applications for this position and as assistant chief are now being received. Men of high caliber are being sought as is evidenced by the fact that the Division Chief will receive a salary of \$10,000 to \$12,000. Certain advantages that accompany employment by an international body make the position still more attractive.

The organization is financed by contributions from the member nations. The share of our government during the first year will be \$625,000. Thereafter it is expected to be about \$1,250,000 or not more than 25% of the total FAO budget.

Headquarters for the organization are at present in Washington but will eventually be moved to whatever site in this country the UNO decides upon for its headquarters. UNO officials are now endeavoring to choose a site in the area between Philadelphia and Boston.

At present FAO is engaged in preparing a world balance sheet for food and agriculture products. Most of the

work on the fisheries balance sheet is being done by Federal fishery experts in Washington. As might be expected it is a difficult job because of the very lack of information that FAO hopes to overcome.

FAO cannot become active in fisheries matters until the world balance sheet is completed and submitted to the forthcoming meeting of the Executive Committee. Then a Division Chief for Fisheries must be named and a technical staff assembled. Finally, a choice must be made with regard to the relative importance of the various items on the approved program. Preliminary discussions have indicated that among the most pressing needs are the utilization of gluts, the elimination of exchange and transport difficulties, international agreements to prevent overfishing in areas closed by the war, and better information on all phases of fishery production and trade.

The immediate effect of FAO on American fisheries cannot be great because it is still in the process of organization and its program will require time to develop. What the long term effect will be depends to a large degree upon the cooperation the Member nations extend and the type of program followed. FAO can be distinctly beneficial if it achieves its aim of promoting international cooperation rather than international competition.

Director-General Sir John Orr believes there should be no gluts. He believes that it is FAO's responsibility to eliminate them by finding ways and means to distribute surpluses in areas of scarcity. If FAO can accomplish this the gain will be two-fold. New fish consumers will be created and the price-depressing effects of overproduction will no longer be a marketing factor.

Raise Standards of Living

One of FAO's primary purposes is to raise standards of living. This cannot help but make better markets for all of our goods including fish. The average income of farm families in India is less than \$25 annually. If such incomes were raised a tremendous market for our less expensive canned fish products might be developed which, in turn, would mean less competition for our higher priced varieties.

In raising standards of living FAO undoubtedly will aid some countries to increase their fisheries production which may, in some instances, increase the competition or eliminate a particular market for our fishery products. In such cases we are assured that the increased income level provides greater markets for our other goods, such as industrial products for example. These greater markets in turn expand our home market for fishery products.

Possibly one of the first fields in which FAO will become effective is in the better exchange of fisheries information. Considerable benefit can be expected from a general exchange of

data. It is true we have much to give, but we also have much to learn in certain branches. Furthermore, it must be recognized that any information we might desire to withhold almost always can be obtained elsewhere and usually to the eventual detriment of our industrial exporters, and sometimes to our national security.

Although we have been discussing the probable effects of FAO on American fisheries it is possible that a new international organization about which little has been said may be a much more important factor. In a November speech delivered at Charleston, S. C., our Secretary of State described a proposed international trade organization. Among the proposals which he explained would be submitted at a conference on trade and employment were the following:

"... that commercial quotas and embargoes be restricted to a few really necessary cases. . .

"... that tariffs be reduced and tariff preferences eliminated.

"... that subsidies, in general, should be the subject of international discussions, and that subsidies on ex-

ports be confined to exceptional cases. . .

"... that Governments conducting public enterprises in foreign trade . . . give fair treatment to the commerce of friendly nations . . . make their purchases and sales on purely economic grounds . . . avoid using monopoly of imports to give excessive protection to their own producers.

"... that international cartels and monopolies be prevented, by international action, from restricting the commerce of the world.

"... that the special problems of the great primary commodities should be studied internationally, and that consuming countries should have an equal voice with producing countries in whatever decisions may be made."

Current reports indicate that an international conference to consider these problems may be called during the first half of 1946. If a permanent organization is established to handle these matters it is quite probable that its activities, particularly with regard to distribution and marketing, may have a much more profound effect on our fisheries than FAO's program as outlined at present.

Status of DDT in the Control of Insects of Canning Industry

By F. C. Bishopp, Assistant Chief,
Bureau of Entomology and
Plant Quarantine

RAW PRODUCTS CONFERENCE

Entomologists are striving to eliminate or reduce losses due to insects that attack fruits and vegetables. This objective may be accomplished by increasing yields of products that are free from blemishes, contamination by insect fragments and by the avoidance of unsightly or dangerous residues of insecticides. The objectives of the entomologists are essentially those of the farmer and food processor and are certainly desirable as far as the consumer is concerned.

The fight on insects would therefore seem to be one battle in which all the people can unite and present an undivided front.

The first thought of the entomologist naturally is what line of attack can be relied upon to give the most effective control of an insect pest. The second, is the control method reasonable in cost and easily applied. Third, will its direct application damage the crop at any stage of growth. Fourth, will its presence in or on the soil interfere with the germination of any crop. Fifth, will its use in any way encourage the increase of any crop pests. Sixth, will it adversely affect the color, flavor or other desirable qualities of the crop. Seventh, will it leave residues on the crop that may be unsightly or present a possible health hazard. Eighth, will its use adversely affect other beneficial forms of life such as pollinating in-

sects, birds, toads or fish. Ninth, can it be safely and effectively used in combination with other insecticides and especially fungicides. Tenth, will it give satisfactory control of other pest insects associated with the one receiving major consideration. Eleventh, is its performance seriously altered when it is used under the many different climatic, soil and agricultural conditions met in this country.

So you see that an insecticide to be generally and fully acceptable must measure up to many standards. The taking of such measurements requires considerable time and the cooperation of farmers and processors with entomologists and men trained in several other sciences. We endeavor to apply these measurements to every insecticide recommended to the public and in the case of DDT have been applying them as rapidly as possible since receiving from Switzerland in the fall of 1942 the initial 2 pounds of the material, the nature of which was unknown to us at the time, but which was reported to have insecticidal properties.

Early tests of this material against body lice of man at our Orlando, Florida, laboratory were so promising as to cause our chemists to take immediate steps to identify it. This they promptly succeeded in doing and tests of it against other pests were undertaken. The results of these tests, especially against lice, mosquitoes, flies, bedbugs, and fleas were spectacular.

Some of the results of tests on crop pests—particularly the codling moth

and a number of plant bugs that were very hard to kill, were striking.

Stories of the wonder insecticide began to find prominent places in magazines and newspapers. Some of these were overdrawn and the public read much more into them. They argued, if an insecticide sprayed on the walls would continue to kill flies and mosquitoes for months why wouldn't it serve to wipe out all our insect enemies.

The public became increasingly impatient in their desire to get hold of some DDT and the Department and State Agricultural Experiment Stations were pressed for results and recommendations.

Toxicity of insecticidal residues is of paramount importance in the marketing of fruits and vegetables especially leafy vegetables. In the case of DDT which was first developed in this country for use of the armed forces the whole question of toxicity had to be gone into before recommendations could be made for use on troops. Through the active cooperation of the National Institute of Health and the Food and Drug Administration with the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine and the Office of Scientific Research and Developments an intensive study of the toxicity of DDT to higher animals was carried out. These investigations have shown that DDT is poisonous to warmblooded animals when ingested or absorbed through the skin in considerable quantities in the form of oil solutions. Its acute and subacute toxicity to higher animals is markedly less than that of many materials commonly used as insecticides. DDT has no appreciable sensitizing action, and the use of powders or water dispersible material on the skin is without irritating or other ill effects.

One of the most characteristic properties of DDT is its stability and persistence. This property which makes it so outstanding as an insect killer also adds to the residue problem. It persists on plants for considerable periods and is difficult to remove by washing or rubbing. As yet no satisfactory method of removing DDT residues has been devised. Exposure to bright sunlight apparently causes it to lose its toxicity to some extent and wind and heavy rains appear to remove some of it. There is no clear evidence as yet that DDT is absorbed by plants or translocated either when it is applied to the plants themselves or put into the soil in which they are grown.

California authorities, however, report recovering DDT in the rinds of oranges after applying DDT as a spray. This was probably due to a small amount of the material being dissolved in the oil in the rinds.

Reports that DDT has been found in potato tubers following the treatment of the plants with DDT insecticides are disquieting. Analysis by the chemists of the Insecticide Division of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quar-

antine of potatoes from experimental plots in Maryland, Maine and Washington which were treated with as much 24 pounds of DDT per acre, failed to reveal any definite evidence of the presence of DDT. Analysis has shown a slight increase in chlorine content in treated over untreated but this has not been confirmed as DDT by the colorimetric test. It should be said in passing that these chemists are the leading authorities in this country in chemistry of DDT and have developed the most sensitive method for detection of DDT.

Heavier Soils Less Affected

On the heavier soils and well-manured soils the plants are much less affected by the DDT. Tests carried on at the Japanese Beetle Laboratory at Moorestown, New Jersey, prove that the application of 25 pounds of DDT per acre retains its toxicity to Japanese beetle larvae for at least 2 years. A 100 percent kill of beetle grubs was secured at this time and the soil may be regarded as still possessing some toxicity. DDT does not appear to have material germicidal or fungicidal effect; however, it is compatible with many of the common fungicides.

DDT applied to the soil may cause injury to plants grown therein. Tests carried out by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine have shown that many plants are not adversely affected when grown in soils to which has been added 50 to 100 pounds of technical DDT per acre. A few are injured by as little as 25 pounds per acre. These include bush and lima beans, rye, and squash. Experiments which the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine has carried out and others which the Bureau of Plant Industry Soils and Agriculture Engineering have under way show that a tremendous difference in effect on plants is evident when they are grown in soils of different types after the addition of DDT. Adverse effects on plants are much more evident in sandy soils and those of low fertility.

Among the most disturbing things is the finding that when DDT is fed to animals in considerable quantities that it is stored in the fat and also excreted in the milk. For these reasons the Bureau is withholding recommendations for the use of this material on crops, portions of which are fed to livestock, until more is learned about these toxicological questions.

It should be pointed out that the circumstances under which DDT has been developed have led to the most critical examination of the toxicology of DDT to which any insecticide has been subjected. Furthermore because of the publicity given to DDT and the precautions that should attend its use the public is prone to attribute to it any illness or other ill effects that can be associated even remotely with its use. Witness several cases of human illness and death reported as DDT poisoning

all of which upon thorough investigation by Dr. Paul A. Neal of the National Institute of Health have been found erroneous. As a matter of fact, Dr. Neal has pointed out that no instance has been found in which a person has been poisoned from the use of DDT itself in insect control operations. Another example is the case in which rock fish dying in the Potomac was first charged to the use of DDT in mosquito control. Investigation showed the DDT to have been applied a month previous to the mortality and 10 miles from the area where the trouble occurred, and that observations were made at the place and time of application and no ill effects on fish resulted.

The importance of exhaustive studies of the toxicology of DDT and other insecticides should not be minimized nor should any steps be overlooked to avoid health hazards from insecticide residues. As you know the Food and Drug Administration has not yet fixed a DDT residue tolerance on food products but it has indicated a tentative tolerance of 7 parts per million on apples and pears. This is the same quantity as allowed for lead and fluorine.

DDT Supplies and Formulations

At the end of the war some 15 companies were manufacturing DDT. Production was at the rate of about 3 million pounds per month of the technical and aerosol grades combined.

In recent months practically this entire quantity has been going into civilian channels. It therefore appears that supplies will be adequate to meet demands for this year.

Technical DDT is the commercial unrefined material which is made up of about 74 per cent of the so-called para-para-prime isomer, 25 percent of the ortho-para-prime isomer and 1 percent of impurities. The first is the most active insecticidally. The aerosol grade of DDT is manufactured by a different process. Since it is purer than the technical grade it has been used mainly as an aerosol.

The chemical DDT as such is not suitable for use as an insecticide. It is used against insects in 4 general forms: (1) As a dust finely ground with a carrier such as pyrophyllite, talc or sulfur, (2) as a solution, dissolved in an organic solvent such as kerosene, fuel oil, or xylene, (3) as an emulsion, dissolved in a solvent with an emulsifying agent added so that it will mix readily with water, (4) as a water dispersible powder. This is prepared by finely grinding the DDT with a suitable carrier, adding wetting and dispersing agents so that it will remain suspended in water. These water dispersible or wettable materials are being prepared with varying amounts of DDT, usually 25, 50 or even 90 percent. (5) As solutions in liquefied gas for use as aerosols. The aerosol "bomb" widely used in the war and now used in the household is an example.

Each of these types of preparations have uses to which it is well adapted, but for application to plants, dusts and water dispersible powders will probably be used most widely. Tests of water dispersible powders on truck crop pests, however, have not been extensive. These preparations are less likely than oils or emulsions to injure foliage and are entirely safe to handle.

The dusts are usually employed at strengths of 2 to 10 percent and the sprays at the rate of $\frac{1}{4}$ to 1 pound of DDT to 100 gallons of water. In general, the quantity of DDT applied per acre is the crucial point rather than the strength of the material used. Because of the difficulty of properly preparing dust mixtures, emulsions and water dispersible powders it would be best to have such material prepared by manufacturers with adequate facilities and not rely on home mixing.

Some Results of Experimental Work

You may be interested in a brief review of some of the results of experimental work carried out by the Bureau on vegetable crops and fruit pests, and against insects that frequent canneries.

It should be emphasized at the outset that DDT is not uniformly effective against all insects and related forms. In fact, there are some pests which are so resistant to it as to make its use impractical. This is true of such pests as the Mexican bean beetle, red spiders, the tomato russet mite, grasshoppers and some aphids. Of course, it is possible that its efficacy against these resistant forms may be increased by the use of other formulations or methods of application.

Highly satisfactory control of the tomato fruitworm in southern California has resulted from the use of a 10 percent DDT dust in sulfur and pyrophyllite. In some tests the DDT-sulfur-pyrophyllite mixture also controlled associated infestations of the tomato fruitworm, tomato hornworms, the beet armyworm, several species of the climbing cutworms and the tomato insect mite on tomatoes. Three applications were made at the rate of 20 to 40 pounds per acre or a total of about 9 pounds of DDT. It appears that the sulfur in the mixture controlled the russet mite.

Against the pea aphid 5 percent DDT dust has given results equal if not superior to rotenone dusts in tests at Madison, Wisconsin, and Moscow, Idaho. Field tests carried out in cooperation with the University of Maryland involving the application of DDT in liquefied gas aerosols for pea aphid control were very promising. The pea weevil yielded as satisfactorily to 5 percent DDT dust as to 175 percent rotenone dusts in extensive tests in Idaho. Even with these good results DDT is not to be recommended for the pea weevil or pea aphid where the pea vines are to be used as stock food particularly for milk cows unless current

investigations show there is no health hazard involved.

The bean leafhopper which carries "hopper burn" of beans was controlled in some tests with 5 percent DDT dust. Against the corn earworm on beans 3 percent DDT dust gave better control than cryolite as generally recommended.

DDT applied as a 3 percent dust at 20 pounds per acre per application has given satisfactory control of the common green cabbage caterpillars.

While DDT has been found to be very effective for control of the European corn borer in experiments conducted on sweet corn, its possible use on canning corn remains to be determined. Applied as either spray or dust preparations in the usual schedule of 4 applications at five-day intervals, beginning with first hatch of the borer, and at rates of from $\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 pounds of technical DDT per acre per application, reductions in population in both stalks and ears of over 90 percent have been secured. This compares favorably with results from the use of rotenone. Insecticidal treatment of canning corn is still considered to be too costly for practical use, and this consideration in combined action with the need to increase our information on residual deposits and their possible poisonous hazards does not permit a recommendation for its use on canning corn for the coming season. Similarly, while DDT has been found to be very effective for control of the corn earworm on sweet corn, methods of application and modifications in use to avoid possible residue hazards have not as yet been developed.

Use of DDT in combating the codling moth is attracting more attention than any other problem in fruit insect control. Experiments conducted on a considerable scale with DDT sprays for codling moth control have shown $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 pound of DDT to 100 gallons of water to give results superior to 3 pounds of lead arsenate. Mixtures of 4 to 8 ounces of DDT with lead arsenate, nicotine bentonite or cryolite (in the Northwest) at about half the usual strength have also given good results.

The use of DDT on apple trees, however has given rise in some instances, to increased abundance of and injury from orchard mites.

DDT appears very promising for use against the oriental fruit moth, a peach insect which has been very difficult to deal with. Unfortunately, the material is very destructive to the fruit moth parasite which has been depended upon very largely to hold the pest down. Work in this field must be regarded as still in a preliminary stage.

The Japanese beetle is more effectively controlled with DDT than any other insecticide. This insect is a pest of importance to early apples and peaches as well as many other plants. One pound of DDT to 100 gallons of water applied as a spray at the first of the beetle flight has given complete

protection through the entire beetle season. The application to the soil of 25 pounds of DDT per acre has also given good control of the Japanese beetle grubs. The build-up of mites following the use of DDT has to be watched but the single application does not appear to present a hazard as far as residues are concerned.

Benzene Hexachloride

Considerable interest is being manifested in the benzene hexachloride which has been called "666". This material is showing promise against a number of insects some of which are not readily controlled by DDT. The material is a complicated one and it is not standardized or in large scale production in this country. One of the chief objections to the commercial material is its persistent musty odor which is taken up by fruits and may affect vegetables. Relatively little is known of its toxicology, and its effect on plants and soils. Much experimental work therefore remains to be done before this material can be recommended.

Control of Insects in Packing Plants

Those connected with the canning industry are much interested in the control of insects in packing plants. The more important of these insects are the housefly, blowflies, mosquitoes, and vinegar flies. Cockroaches are also occasionally concerned. Sanitation consisting of proper disposal of wastes and care in bringing in infested fruits and vegetables are very important control steps. DDT is a first class supplemental method of control. Spraying the packing plants both inside and out and adjacent sheds and other buildings with DDT will greatly reduce fly, mosquito and cockroach abundance. For interiors a 5 percent solution of DDT in deodorized kerosene is recommended. This should be put on as a rather coarse spray preferably with a flat type nozzle, and the walls, floors and ceilings should be covered at the rate of about 1 gallon

of the solution to 1,000 square feet. Under usual conditions this material will remain effective in killing the flies and mosquitoes that come in contact with it for a period of several months. Probably the steam and water used in packing houses would shorten the period of effectiveness, particularly against cockroaches. Care should be exercised to avoid getting the DDT solution into the utensils and on fruit and vegetables to be canned.

In applying oil sprays it is advisable to use a respirator and if the solution comes in contact with the skin it should be removed rather promptly with soap and water.

Recommendations

The Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine has been conservative in recommending the use of DDT, and we think rightfully so. A release from the Department of Agriculture issued August 22, 1945 gives the recommendations which it was felt could be made safely at that time. Possible additional uses will be suggested by the Department before the next crop season but we do not anticipate that any radical departure will be made from previous recommendations in the case of the truck crops and fruits with which you are especially concerned. The main point is that DDT or other toxic insecticides should not be applied to leafy vegetables after the leaves which will be marketed, are formed on the plant.

No doubt considerable quantities will be used on various crops regardless of recommendations. It is understood that some of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations are recommending the use of DDT against certain insects and crops which this Bureau has not included in its recommended uses. In order to be as helpful as possible and reduce any element of danger, the Bureau plans to make suggestions to those planning to use DDT as to the best procedures in preparing and applying it.

New Methods of Weed Control in Canning Crops

By L. W. Kephart, Agricultural Research Administration, USDA

RAW PRODUCTS CONFERENCE

To overcome the excessive cost of weeding young canning crops by hand, five new methods are under trial: (1) soil treatments, (2) pre-emergence weed killing, (3) selective spraying, (4) flaming and (5) "brush" weeding.

The most promising soil treatment is steaming with a special machine which lifts a strip of soil, subjects it to superheated steam and replaces it, all in one operation. Wire worms, insects and some weed seeds are destroyed. Other methods involve the use of urea, calcium cyanamide, DD and other seed-destroying chemicals. All these are still in the experimental stages.

Pre-emergence weeding means killing the weed seedlings before the crop seedlings have emerged. It is one of the most promising of the labor saving ideas. The soil is put into final condition for planting, then allowed to stand idle for from two to seven days. In that time most of the weed seeds in the upper $\frac{1}{2}$ inch of soil germinate and the seedlings are killed by flaming with special blowtorches or spraying with selected chemicals. The next day the crop is planted with special machines that do not disturb the soil. This eliminates 90 percent of the subsequent hand weeding.

Simple weed burners using compressed butane or other gas have shown some advantage over spraying with oils, 2,4-D, di-nitro compounds and other chemicals. The disadvantages of

the system are the care needed in laying out the rows, the need of special planters and the time lost waiting for the weed seeds to germinate.

Selective spraying has had a tremendous increase in the past five years since the discovery in California that young carrots could be sprayed with oil without injury to the crop but with a high mortality to weed seedlings. The crop is sprayed when the carrots are in the two- to four-leaf stage with special oils having a high content of "aromatics" but with low flavor and high volatility. Unfortunately none of the important canning crops has been sprayed safely with oils or oil solvents. A more promising selective spray for canning crops is 2,4-D in combination with other chemicals. Thus far corn and asparagus have shown best results with this method.

Flaming with weed burners, after the crop is up, has been widely adopted by cotton growers and holds some promise for corn, possibly beans and perhaps other canning crops. Flaming is a delicate operation requiring a skilled operator but it is highly satisfactory when properly done. The process is patented.

"Brush" weeding is the name applied to a process of brushing the young crop with specially designed mechanical brushes. The inventors claim fine destruction of many kinds of weeds on some kinds of crops. Sufficient time has not elapsed to enable these claims to be checked.

For most canning crops pre-emergence weeding, either with flame or chemicals, offers at present the most promise of relief from the high cost of hand weeding.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION

Labeling

RESOLVED, that the Association endorses the labeling terms which have been selected and adopted for recommendation by the Association's Committee on Labeling and approved by the several distributors' organizations, and that the Association urges upon every canner, distributor, and other organization directly or indirectly engaged in merchandising canned foods under their own labels the adoption and use at the earliest possible time of these recommended uniform labeling terms.

Canned Food Information

WHEREAS, the industry is appreciative of the interest in canned foods displayed by voluntary and genuine consumer organizations and their confidence in the continuing improvement of quality of canned foods; be it

RESOLVED, that the National Canners Association continue to disseminate authentic information concerning the production and distribution of canned foods to the end that the public, and particularly organizations of consumers, may have full knowledge of the industry and its products;

RESOLVED, that the Home Economics Division and the Division of Statistics and the Division of Information of the Association continue their activities in the preparation and distribution of information to individuals and organizations concerned with problems that directly or indirectly affect the canning industry;

RESOLVED, that the State and regional canners associations be requested to cooperate with the National Canners Association in the furtherance of this program;

RESOLVED, that each member of the canning industry accept individual and

personal responsibility for keeping his own community and the consumers of his own products fully and correctly informed on the industry's problems and policies.

Labor

WHEREAS, it appears that 125,000 prisoners of war were utilized in the harvesting and processing of the 1945 crop and that no prisoners of war are likely to be available in 1946 and,

WHEREAS, 90,000 imported foreign laborers were utilized in the harvesting and processing of the 1945 crop and this number will be substantially reduced in 1946, and

WHEREAS, the labor situation in the canning industry will be more difficult in 1946 than in 1945; be it

RESOLVED, that whether or not jurisdiction over governmental employment services is entrusted to the States or to the Federal Government, every effort should be made by each of the agencies concerned to facilitate the interstate recruitment of labor for the processing of canned foods; and be it further

RESOLVED, that each of the agencies concerned be requested to make every effort to secure for the available agricultural and processing labor the necessary housing, equipment, and supplies from surplus war goods and all other sources.

Nutrition Research

RESOLVED, that the Association endorse the joint program in progress by the National Canners Association and the Can Manufacturers Institute of research on the nutritional values of canned foods and the retention of vitamin content to the end that the value of canned foods may be better known to the consumer.

Fred A. Stare

The termination of World War II and the beginning of the period of postwar adjustment bring a new and challenging set of problems for the canning industry. Fortunate it is that in this period the Association has had and will continue to have the leadership of President Fred A. Stare. His knowledge of the industry's widespread operation, his insight and sureness of judgment, his untiring and painstaking execution of the responsibilities of his office enable the Association to go forward with renewed confidence. For the many canners throughout the country, his continuance in office will offer continued opportunities to share his innate graciousness and gentle charm and to benefit from his ability and zeal in his unstinting work for the industry.

Frank E. Gorrell

In great measure it is due to the ability and untiring efforts of one man that the National Canners Association has grown to its present stature and that its annual convention has become an event of national importance and the focal point of activity for the entire food processing and distributing industries. For the first time in thirty-nine years Frank E. Gorrell, our Treasurer, is absent from the convention because of temporary illness. His absence only emphasizes his real presence in the continuing activities of the Association, manifested so effectively at this convention, and in the thoughts of each of us. To him each member of the Association extends affectionate greetings and a wish for his speedy recovery.

Carlos Campbell

Years of effective service in directing the activities of the Statistical Division thoroughly qualified Carlos Campbell to take the helm of Association staff direction in traversing the difficult years of post-war adjustment. To him the Association desires to express its appreciation for undertaking this task and its confidence in his ability and sagacity, and the competence and energy of his staff, effectively to carry on the affairs of the Association.

Necrology

As it enters the post-war years the canning industry and the Association will lack the counsel and leadership and the devoted service of many who have contributed greatly to their development. The passing of these friends of the factory, the market place, and the conference room leaves each of us with a poignant realization of our loss. During the past year we have had to mourn the death of—

George W. Conn, 74, former vice-president of the American Can Company and known to canners throughout the entire country, who died in Sebring,

Florida, of a heart attack on February 27. Before he became a can manufacturing executive Mr. Cobb had been a member of a canning family known as the proprietors of the Cobb Preserving Company at Fairport, N. Y. He won industry renown as one of the active promoters and sponsors of the sanitary can, the modern container that superseded the hole-and-cap can of early days. A past president of the Canning Machinery & Supplies Association and of the Old Guard Society, Mr. Cobb was one of the most popular after-dinner speakers in the trade and a regular attendant at canning conventions during his lifetime.

MICHAEL S. HUFFMAN, 62, brother of the late president of Continental Can Company, Oscar C. Huffman, died in a Washington, D. C., hospital on July 18. Like his late brother, Mr. Huffman was a pioneer in the metal container industry, and prior to his retirement from business in 1939 had been in active contact with the canning and allied trades.

PRESTON MCKINNEY, 64, who devoted 25 years of leadership to the affairs of the Canners League of California, died at his San Francisco home, October 12. His contribution was made not only to the State-wide affairs of California canners, but he was an important factor in national activities of the industry. During the days of NRA he served as a member of its Industrial Advisory Board and was active in AAA matters. His participation in National Canners Association affairs was outstanding, including service during the period 1922 to 1941 on the Resolutions, Traffic, Pro-Rata, Statistics, and National Defense Committees. His competence in dealing effectively with the business responsibilities entrusted to him by his associates was exceeded only by his warm friendliness, his gracious charm, and his abundant cheerfulness.

ARTHUR A. MORSE, one of the charter members of the Board of Governors of the Can Manufacturers Institute, Inc., died at his home in Pacific Palisades, California, on March 27. Mr. Morse was connected with the American Can Company for a number of years.

ROBERT MULREE, 70, production executive of Birds-Eye-Snider Division of General Foods Corporation, passed away at Rochester, N. Y., on January 23, following a brief illness. Mr. Mulree had been active in the canning industry for more than 50 years, dating back to his association with the Burt Olney Canning Company at Oneida, N. Y., in 1893. He had served as a member of the Board of Directors and secretary of one of the Association's commodity sections.

LEVI B. PHILLIPS, 76, who, with his brother Albanus and W. G. Winterbottom, founded the Phillips Packing Co., at Cambridge, Md., in 1900, died April 7, in Baltimore following a long illness.

WILLIAM BURNETT STOKELY, 72, died May 26 at his home in Newport, Tennessee. He was the last of the four brothers who founded the Stokely Brothers Canning Company in 1898. A prominent figure in the canning industry for many years, Mr. Stokely was active also in the National Canners Association, having served as a Director in 1920-22 and 1926-28.

CLAUDE E. STREET, 77, pioneer grapefruit juice canner in Florida, and one of the founders of the Florida Grapefruit Canners Association, died at Winter Haven, January 10.

CHARLES G. SUMMERS, JR., 74, president of the firm of Charles G. Summers, Jr., Inc., New Freedom, Pa., died November 12 at a Baltimore hospital, following a brief illness. A veteran of 60 years association in the canning business, Mr. Summers was an active leader in both State and national association work. For 13 consecutive years he held the presidency of the Pennsylvania Canners Association and his participation in affairs of the National Canners Association was prominent for more than a decade, during which time he served two terms on the Board of Directors.

WALTER TREGO, who was associated with his brother, the late Edward P. Trego, in the Hoopeston Canning Company at Hoopeston, Ill., died April 26. Mr. Trego served on the N.C.A. Definitions and Standards Committee from 1927 to 1932, and was a Director of the Association in 1930, 1931, and 1932.

JOHN WATERHOUSE, president of Alexander and Baldwin, died from a stroke in Honolulu, October 11, following a long illness. He was president of the Association of Hawaiian Pineapple Canners in 1932 and 1933 and was one of the group that was active in the formation of its successor organization, the Pineapple Producers Cooperative Association, of which he was president from 1934 to 1938.

KARL KUNER MAYER died on January 30, 1946. Mr. Mayer was a past president of the Association, a former director, and for many years participated actively in the work of the Association. Among his many contributions to the Association was his enthusiasm in fostering the development of the work of the Statistics and Home Economics Divisions of the Association; and during his term as president and for many years as Chairman of the Committee on Statistics, he was in great measure responsible for the organization and growth of the Statistical Division. His sincerity, zeal and unselfish devotion to the welfare of the canning industry as a whole won him the respect and friendship of canners in every part of the country.

In the thirty-eighth year of its service to the canning industry the Association suffered the loss of two of its

staff members who had contributed largely and effectively to its growth and success. With deep sorrow we record the passing of **GERTRUDE SPEIDEN KISSELL** and **LOUIS DASHIELL**.

For three and one-half decades the Association had the faithful and efficient services of Louis Dashiell, a man who was ever ready to undertake cheerfully and ably whatever duties were assigned to him. He enjoyed the confidence of the Association's members and the affectionate respect of his fellow employees.

For several years prior to her death on November 27, 1945, Mrs. Kissell had been in charge of the microanalytical work of the Research Laboratory, and her competence and judgment in this field had won for her recognition throughout the entire canning industry. In addition to assisting members of the Association in the solution of important and often difficult problems of factory control, she took a major part in organizing and conducting the tomato product schools in various parts of the country. In this capacity she had helped to train a great many technicians for continued service to the canning industry. She was deeply loved by all those with whom she worked.

The Secretary of the Association is directed appropriately to convey to the family of each of these the sense of this resolution.

Guest Speakers

WHEREAS, the success of the 1946 Annual Convention is attributable in a large measure to the exceptional character of our guest speakers, to the splendid cooperation of Government agencies and of allied industries, and to the coverage provided by the daily and trade press and radio networks; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the President and Secretary of the National Canners Association be directed to express to each of them our appreciation of their friendly cooperation and valuable contributions.

New Jersey Senate

RESOLVED, that the National Canners Association on behalf of the canning industry and allied trades attending the Atlantic City Convention express to the Senate of the State of New Jersey their deep appreciation of the resolution of welcome passed by the Senate on January 28, 1946.

Next Annual Convention

RESOLVED, that the President of the National Canners Association be authorized to act for the Association in selecting the location for the next Annual Convention.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The National Canners Association, in Convention at Atlantic City, N. J., February 3-8, 1946, elected the following officers and directors. The Secretary and Treasurer continued in office.

Officers

President—Fred A. Stare, Columbus Foods Corp., Columbus, Wis. (reelected).

First Vice President—Emil Rutz, Schuckl and Co., Inc., Sunnyvale, Calif.

Second Vice President—Alfred W. Eames, California Packing Corp., San Francisco, Calif. (reelected).

Secretary—Carlos Campbell, Washington, D. C.

Treasurer—Frank E. Gorrell, Washington, D. C.

Board of Directors

For 3 Years

C. R. Barnhart, Winorr Canning Co., Circleville, Ohio

L. L. Becker, Adams Packing Coop., Canning Div., Auburndale, Fla.

Luke Beckman, Minster Canning Co., Minster, Ohio

F. A. Blankenship, Good Canning Co., Fort Smith, Ark.

L. J. Campodonico, Drew Canning Co., Ltd., Campbell, Calif.

Henry P. Cannon II, H. P. Cannon & Son, Inc., Bridgeville, Del.

H. T. Cumming, Curtiss Brothers Co., Rochester, N. Y.

Wm. R. Eddington, Eddington Canning Co., Springville, Utah

Wm. H. Foster, Foster & Wood Canning Co., Lodi, Calif.

Robert A. Friend, Friend Brothers, Inc., Melrose, Mass.

Clark Hagan, Sac City Canning Corp., Sac City, Iowa

H. J. Humphrey, Snider Packing Div. of General Foods Corp., Rochester, N. Y.

Earle Johnson, Gerber Products Co., Fremont, Mich.

Roy G. Lucks, California Packing Corp., San Francisco, Calif.

K. H. Nelson, Otoe Food Products Co., Nebraska City, Nebr.

J. B. Park, Brandywine Mushroom Corp., West Chester, Pa.

Walter Scheid, Loudon Div. of Standard Brands, Napoleon, Ohio

O. E. Snider, Blue Lake Producers Coop., Salem, Ore.

Marcus L. Urann, Cranberry Canners, Inc., Hanson, Mass.

Alan R. Warehime, Hanover Canning Co., Hanover, Pa.

Ed Watson, PictSweet Foods, Inc., Mt. Vernon, Wash.

L. J. Weix, Oconomowoc Canning Co., Oconomowoc, Wis.

For 2 Years

J. J. Bogdanovich, French Sardine Co., Terminal Island, Calif.

Ben F. Counter, Fort Lupton Canning Co., Fort Lupton, Colo.

Robert Flowers, Mitchell Canneries, Thomasville, Ga.

W. T. Dixon Gibbs, Gibbs & Co., Inc., Baltimore, Md.

F. Lowden Jones, Walla Walla Canning Co., Walla Walla, Wash.

A. D. Kennedy, Crosse & Blackwell Co., Baltimore, Md.

Cassius L. Kirk, Bozeman Canning Co., Bozeman, Mont.

M. E. Khouse, Khouse Corp., Peach Glen, Pa.

N. J. Lau, Clyman Canning Co., Clyman, Wis.

H. E. MacConaughay, Hawaiian Pineapple Co., San Francisco, Calif.

Geo. B. Morrill, Jr., Burnham & Morrill Co., Portland, Me.

Harold Patterson, Lyndonville Canning Co., Lyndonville, N. Y.

Guy E. Pollock, Marshall Canning Co., Marshalltown, Iowa

Louis Ratzenberger, Illinois Canning Co., Hoopeston, Ill.

Louis H. Schlecht, Rossville Packing Co., Rossville, Ill.

A. D. Schwaner, F. M. Ball & Co., Oakland, Calif.

C. Courtney Seabrook, Deerfield Packing Corp., Bridgeton, N. J.

K. K. Soule, Monmouth Canning Co., Portland, Me.

S. G. Wimmer, S. G. Wimmer & Son, Christiansburg, Va.

Directors Whose Terms Held Over

Robert Baker, Baker Canning Co., Theresa, Wis.

W. E. Beach, McKeon Canning Co., Inc., Burbank, Calif.

E. M. Brennan, P. E. Harris & Co., Seattle, Wash.

Ralph M. Butterfield, Eaton Canning Co., Eaton, Ind.

E. C. Christensen, Christensen Products Co., Weslaco, Tex.

S. R. Clevenger, Bush Brothers & Co., Dandridge, Tenn.

A. E. Coddington, Quality Products Co., Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.

William N. Colonna, John W. Taylor Packing Co., Inc., Hallwood, Va.

W. F. Dietrich, Minnesota Valley Canning Co., Le Sueur, Minn.

S. E. W. Friel, Jr., S. E. W. Friel, Queenstown, Md.

George H. Hall, George H. Hall & Sons, Inc., Dexter, Me.

John R. Hinton, Blundon & Hinton, Reedville, Va.

S. A. Holman, Libby, McNeill & Libby, Chicago, Ill.

H. D. Landes, Pleasant Grove Canning Co., Pleasant Grove, Utah

Moses P. Lawrence, North Lubec Mfg. & Canning Co., North Lubec, Me.

C. J. Meister, Fairmont Canning Co., Fairmont, Minn.

Chester A. Ray, New Era Canning Co., New Era, Mich.

Kenneth N. Rider, Kenneth N. Rider Co., Trafalgar, Ind.

C. B. Spencer, Spencer Packing Co., Lebanon, Oregon

John Speyer, Baldwin Packers, Ltd., San Francisco, Calif.

William Varney, Varney Canning, Inc., Roy, Utah

1946 FINANCE COMMITTEE

At the closing session on Wednesday, the Convention approved the personnel of the Finance Committee for 1946 announced by President Stare as follows:

G. Sherwin Haxton, Oakfield, N. Y., Chairman

Harold K. Bachelder, Indianapolis, Ind.

Herbert J. Barnes, Kaysville, Utah

E. B. Cosgrove, Le Sueur, Minn.

S. B. Cutright, Hoopeston, Ill.

Ralph O. Dulany, Fruitland, Md.

Alfred W. Eames, San Francisco, Calif.

A. T. Flynn, Chicago, Ill.

Hugh K. Funderburg, Belvidere, Ill.

Frank Gerber, Fremont, Mich.

Walter L. Graefe, Griffin, Ga.

H. E. Gray, San Jose, Calif.

F. A. Harding, Watertown, Mass.

Scott A. Holman, Chicago, Ill.

Marc C. Hutchinson, Fennville, Mich.

H. F. Krimendahl, Celina, Ohio

Wm. C. Kunzman, Brighton, Colo.

Carroll E. Lindsey, Highland City, Fla.

Carl N. Lovegren, San Jose, Calif.

H. E. MacConaughay, San Francisco, Calif.

Art Oppenheimer, Marshalltown, Iowa

Robert C. Paulus, Salem, Oreg.

Ralph Polk, Jr., Tampa, Fla.

E. N. Richmond, San Jose, Calif.

H. N. Riley, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Emil Rutz, Sunnyvale, Calif.

John B. Stokely, Indianapolis, Ind.

Joseph B. Weix, Oconomowoc, Wis.

Oliver G. Willits, Camden, N. J.

Paul H. Wolf, Gwynneville, Ind.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT TO DIRECTORS MEETING

By Walter Graefe, Chairman

What Congress is now doing and what it can be expected to do in the near future will necessarily reflect the fact that the country is now suffering acute postwar economic pains. Once again there seems to have been a demonstration that economic theories and a profound theoretical analysis of what might happen in American business is more than likely to be belied by the facts.

It is now more than six months since V-J Day. The country is in the middle of its most difficult labor crisis. Yet with the exception of tax revision, no major reconversion or postwar legislation has been enacted. Except for the expiration of the Renegotiation Act, and the ending of accelerated tax amortization, neither Congressional nor Executive action has in any way recognized the formal legal termination of the war. On the other hand, there are many who believe that the present economic dislocations are the result of Governmental action, particularly the repeated attempt to lift all controls over wages and at the same time retain control over prices. In any event, it is generally agreed that Congressional action will be necessary to obtain real reconversion to a peacetime economy.

But there is no evidence yet that Congress, in dealing with any of the problems presented, will slavishly follow the Administration. With one minor exception, no part of the President's program, first presented to Congress last September, has been enacted. You will recall that this program sought to maintain full employment during reconversion, to provide for relocation of workers displaced by the shift from war to peace production and to prevent the shortages continuing into the reconversion period from developing into uncontrolled inflation.

Unemployment Compensation Bill—This bill proposes to give \$25 per week for 26 weeks to discharged war workers and was part of the program to assist relocation of workers. You will recall that this provoked a great deal of controversy during consideration by the Senate. Your Committee watched this bill very carefully during the Senate debates and it now appears that the bill has died in the House Ways and Means Committee.

U. S. Employment Service—Related to the unemployment compensation question is the problem of returning the United States Employment Service to the States who relinquished their control during the war. As you all know the USES prior to the war was closely tied in with State unemployment compensation operations. Although the President has requested that the USES be kept under Federal control during the reconversion period to assist in placing discharged workers and returning veterans, a determined

effort has developed to force the return of USES to State management. In the last session supporters of this movement succeeded in attaching a rider to the War Appropriations Re-Scission Bill to return the USES to the States. President Truman vetoed the bill because of this rider and this past January in his veto message reiterated the need for a continued unified Federal employment system during the reconversion period. The opponents of this view contend that return to the States will result in a completely dispersed management preventing interstate cooperation.

As a result of the veto another proposal, H. R. 4437, was introduced and considered by the House this past week. During the House debates the Dirksen Amendment was attached to this bill. This amendment substantially curtailed the federal supervision provided in the bill sponsored by the Administration. It may be that this bill will die in the Senate. It is also believed that the President will veto any bill returning the USES to the States without some provision for interstate cooperation in recruiting employees.

Farm Labor Program—One of the reasons for the desire to return the USES to the States is that the Federal operation has permitted persons who otherwise would try to get jobs to stay on the public payroll. It is reported that the cannery industry has experienced difficulty in obtaining needed labor. Because of this, when it developed that the farm labor supply program might be eliminated or greatly curtailed for 1946, the Association took an active part in assisting to obtain full extension of the program for another year. This should assist our labor supply problems to some extent during 1946.

Price Control—We are all, of course, deeply interested in the price control program for 1946 both as to the continuation of the Price Control Act itself and the continuation of subsidies. In his recent message to Congress the President urged prompt extension of the Price Control Act for at least another year and declared that "any precise appraisal of the economic outlook at this time is particularly difficult . . . in general the outlook for business is good . . . provided we control inflation and achieve peace in management-labor relations . . . but our chief worry is still inflation."

It is quite possible that the Price Control Act and subsidies will be continued in some form. Representative Spence last week introduced H. R. 5270 to extend the subsidy authority and the Price Control Act until June 30, 1947. Whether the present administration intention is to include the subsidies on canned vegetables in this request for extension is not at all clear. Administration statements have referred to minor subsidies. What this means

we do not know. The bill introduced into Congress leaves blank the amount of money requested. Whether the Stabilization Director will ask Congress for authority and appropriations for subsidies on canned vegetables will, we hope, be made clear by Secretary Anderson in his speech. What is clear is that there can be no subsidies unless Congress specifically provides for them.

If such subsidies are terminated the question of farm prices will become increasingly important in connection with price ceilings. In this connection the President said in his message that farm prices for the next year will remain at about 1943 levels. As a long range matter, however, the President looks to a healthy economy as the best way of maintaining farm prices and supplying a proper national diet.

On this matter of diet you will be interested to know that a permanent School Lunch Program was recommended by the President. H. R. 3370 favorably reported by the House Agricultural Committee last spring is designed to carry out this recommendation. This bill introduced by Congressman Flannagan provides for Federal grants to the States for purchases of food. The Federal grant is to be matched by State funds. The grant would be in two forms, money payments and outright donations of surplus foods, including canned foods. In addition the bill would provide Federal aid, necessary facilities, and equipment to perform the School Lunch Program.

Going back to farm prices, it should be remembered that the various legislative devices to maintain farm prices with Government assistance are still in force and may be expanded. For example S. 1527 would extend the Stegall Act support price obligations from two to five years after the war. Farm groups are said to favor this proposal.

Parity—Related to the pricing problem is the question of parity. There are several proposals including S. 507 and H. R. 754 which would change the computation of parity by requesting inclusion of farm labor costs. Even after the need for price control is passed there will remain a rather difficult legislative question of how these possible new obligations might be performed. It has been suggested that the Congressional promise to maintain farm prices might be performed by employing production quotas.

Strikes—Needless to say, Congress is preoccupied with proposals for the control of strikes and the settlement of labor disputes. The Case bill introduced and brought to the floor very quickly last week would impose numerous restrictions on labor. It is now being debated in the House. Congressional consideration of these labor proposals will undoubtedly be prolonged and bitter controversies will result on many of the questions presented.

Full Employment—Related to legislative proposals to control labor controversies is the so-called Full Employment Bill. It will be recalled that the Senate finally enacted a mild version of President Truman's original proposal and the Senate version was further emasculated by the House. The bill is now in conference and it is unlikely that whatever emerges from the conference will be specific or amount to any drastic attempt to overall control of the national economy. It is not unlikely that the Full Employment Bill will die in conference.

Before reviewing the key proposal to amend the Wage and Hour Law, I should like briefly to review several other pending bills.

Taxes—On the tax front it seems probable that the President's recommendation for no tax reduction in 1946 will be followed by Congress. There are, however, some specific and important special tax matters. One of these is the proposal to repeal the unused excess profits tax credit carryback. This proposal as you know mainly grows out of the current labor conflicts. The unions have charged that the excess profits tax carryback amounts to the Government subsidizing the corporations in their resistance to labor union demands. Chairman Doughton has indicated that he will not do anything on this question unless the Administration indicates its policy.

The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is also examining the administration of Section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code. The Committee wants to make the administration of Section 722 more effective and it has been studying the whole problem in great detail. Hearings are scheduled to begin on February 5.

Water Pollution—Another tax matter of importance to the industry is a part of proposed water pollution legislation. Since 1934 there has been an effort to establish a Federal-State water pollution program. H. R. 3972 introduced by Congressman Bailey of West Virginia would permit expenditures for water pollution treatment to be deductible for income tax purposes. As introduced, the Bailey bill appears to be technically imperfect and further study and revision will be necessary. The Legislative Committee is carefully following this bill and there will be active sponsorship of the proposal.

Other proposals of interest are H. R. 2390 to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act on which hearings began January 29. This is mainly of interest to our industry because it may remove the present conflict of jurisdiction between the FTC and the Food and Drug Administration over labeling and advertising.

Wage and Hour Amendments—You will recall that last fall numerous proposals were made to amend the Wage and Hour Act. These included increasing the minimum wage first to

65 and then to 75 cents an hour and to cut down the cannery and fishery maximum exemptions. Raising minimum wages has, as you know, been one of the main points of the President's program. Just as a sidelight Postmaster General Hannegan is reported to be getting together a new brain trust which will concentrate first on getting this minimum wage amendment passed.

You will recall from the careful coverage of the INFORMATION LETTER that long hearings were held before both House and Senate committees and that the Association took a position at these hearings in opposition to any reduction in our present exemptions.

The House Committee has not taken any action on the amendments. The Senate Committee, however, has been tied up for the last two weeks on precisely what it is going to approve. There has been a conflict over whether the new minimum shall be 55 or 65 cents an hour. It has also been informally said that the 7(c) cannery exemption will be eliminated and we will be left only with the seasonal industry

exemption of Section 7(b) (3). This will leave the cannery industry with but one period of 14 weeks of work up to 56 hours per week before overtime has to be paid.

Furthermore, it has been reported that the fishery exemption will be cut to bring the fish canning industry within the minimum wage provisions but will leave them exempt in whole or in part from the overtime requirements. These are all merely informal reports. The Committee has not yet officially acted. While it seems certain that some amendments are going to be favorably reported by the Senate Committee we do not yet know precisely what they are going to be.

This conflict in the Senate Committee supports to some extent the feeling that the House will do no more than act on the Norton Bill. This bill will simply increase the minimum wage from 55 to 65 cents.

The Legislative Committee, of course, is actively following the course of these wage and hour proposals.

REPORT OF ASSOCIATION'S COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

By Henry P. Taylor, Chairman

The Board of Directors, at its November 20, 1945, meeting, authorized the creation of a Special Committee on Committees to review the committee structure of the Association and to make recommendations to the Board at this meeting. President Stare requested the members of the Planning Committee to serve as the personnel of this Committee on Committees.

The Association staff and counsel prepared for the use of the Committee a comprehensive and searching memorandum outlining the history and evolution of each of the Association committees, its membership, its functioning, and its coordination with other committees.

The Committee on Committees met in Washington last week and surveyed this entire matter. There is probably no need to review all of the details of organization and operation which were subjected to analysis. Your Committee makes the following recommendations:

1. That the committees of the Association be reorganized and reconstituted to provide specifically for both Standing Committees and Special Committees.

The Standing Committees of the Association shall include, in addition to those specifically provided for in the By-Laws, those Association committees whose duties are continuing in character and whose activities are not limited to a particular period. Special Committees shall include those whose assignment is temporary in character, which can be completed within a stated period, and upon the completion of its job will permit the Committee to be discharged. The By-Laws provide that all committees shall be appointed by the President.

2. Your Committee recommends that the following Committees be reconstituted as Standing Committees of the Association:

- Committee on Adjustment
- Committee on Consumer Complaints
- Committee on Fishery Products
- Committee on Home Economics
- Committee on Labeling
- Committee on Legislation
- Committee on Raw Products
- Committee on Resolutions
- Committee on Scientific Research
- Committee on Simplification of Containers
- Committee on Statistics
- Committee on Taxation
- Committee on Traffic

All of you undoubtedly are familiar with the functions and activities of these committees. If anyone has any questions we shall be glad to endeavor to answer them. The Committee on Consumer Complaints is new and is designed to afford for this branch of the Association's activities the support of a committee of members such as is provided for each of the other Association activities. The Committee on Taxation has been recommended to provide for a continuity of study of taxation problems which are undoubtedly to be considered by Congress and which are obviously of great importance to members of the industry.

3. Your Committee recommends that the following Special Committees be authorized:

- Building Committee
- Foreign Trade Committee
- Manpower Committee
- Planning Committee

4. Your Committee recommends that the following committees be terminated:

Advisory Board. This Committee has been largely honorary, without specific duties, and it has seldom met. It is composed of all living ex-presidents of the Association who by and large are active on other committees of the Association.

Interim Committee. When the By-laws were last revised the functions of the Interim Committee were, in large part, transferred to the Finance Committee and its remaining functions are sufficiently lodged in the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors. Moreover, what might be called its wartime duties have been more or less exercised by the Planning Committee.

Rationing Committee. The purpose of eliminating this Committee seems obvious.

5. Your Committee further recommends that each of the committees of the Association be given certain general powers. The first is that it be authorized to meet at the call of its Chairman, provided that the time, place, and budgetary arrangements are cleared with the Secretary. Next, we think each committee should be authorized to create such subcommittees as it may deem necessary and desirable, but that in reporting to this Board, the subcommittee should be required to report first to the full committee and the full committee should then report to the Board.

We likewise strongly recommend that each committee of the Association be authorized, through its Chairman, to establish such advisory and technical committees as it may need. These advisory and technical groups can consist of members of the Association or of any other qualified persons who may contribute to the work of the Committee. The members of these advisory or technical committees may be invited to meet with the Association committee provided budgetary clearance is obtained from the Secretary.

6. Your Committee further recommends that the following principles be followed by the President in making appointments to these committees:

Size of Committees. It is recommended that the Association's Standing Committees be of such size as will permit their adequate functioning and obtain appropriate representation of the various elements of the industry yet at the same time not become too large for efficient and economical operation.

Qualifications of Committee Members. It is recommended that the qualifications for membership on a committee shall be training and experience as related to the work to be handled by the committee, adaptability to committee service, and willingness to devote to it the necessary time and energy. It is recommended that the Association compile a roster of members possessing

these qualifications as an aid to the President in making committee appointments.

Representation on Committees. It is recommended that in making appointments to committees the President shall give due consideration to the need of appropriate commodity and regional representation on committees dealing with subjects as to which such broad representation is necessary in order adequately to reflect the needs of the respective commodities and regions in which they are packed. It is also recommended that due consideration be given to securing appropriate representation of firms of different size.

Period of Service on Committees. It is recommended that the policy to be pursued in determining the period of service for either a chairman of a committee or its membership shall in large measure be dictated by the character of the work of such committee. Wherever possible, it is recommended that a minimum of one-third of the members of any committee be familiar with the committee's field of activities, functions, and methods of procedure. Insofar as practicable, and where it will not lessen the effectiveness of the committee and except where the particular status of an individual renders it in the interest of the Association that he be continued either as chairman or as a member of a committee without time limit, it is recommended that the

REPORT OF THE N. C. A. LABELING COMMITTEE

By E. B. Cosgrove, Chairman

The report of E. B. Cosgrove, Chairman of the Labeling Committee of the National Canners Association to the Board of Directors at their meeting February 3, preceding the annual Convention summarizes a trend in attitude toward labeling of consumer products which is apparent to close observers. Mr. Cosgrove's report included the following:

"The tide of labeling has turned. A few years ago much of the discussion of labeling was emotional. But of late, constructive thinking has largely replaced emotion and the effect is wholesome and encouraging.

"The support for the mandatory grade labeling of canned and glassed foods to be imposed by law and Federal regulation has passed its peak and is declining. *Printers Ink* of December 12, 1945, carried a news item which began with the following sentence: 'The militant consumer element is piping down in its demand for mandatory grade labeling.'

"There is much other evidence along these same lines.

"On January 16th, three weeks ago Mr. Alfred Schindler, Under-Secretary of the U. S. Department of Commerce made an address in New York City the title of which was: 'Commercial Standards and Descriptive Labeling.'

general policy shall be to limit service of any individual on any one committee to a period of three years.

Service on More than One Committee. It is recommended that in order to broaden the opportunity for committee service, to make more members thoroughly familiar with Association activities and methods of work, and to increase the proportion of the Association's membership who have a direct and personal interest in its welfare and progress, it shall be the general policy to limit an individual's service on standing committees to one committee, except when, in the judgment of the President and a committee chairman concerned, an exception to this policy is justified. It is further recommended, however, that wherever it will contribute to the advancement of the Association's activity, members serving on one committee be called upon in an advisory or consultative capacity in the work of other committees.

7. Your Committee further recommends to the President that he enlist the cooperation of State Secretaries and officials of State Associations and others to develop a list of canners who by their services on committees may contribute to the advancement of the industry, and that he consider the appointment of an Advisory Committee to assist him in carrying out, insofar as practicable, the recommendations made in this report.

Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson included the following in his address to the Convention on Tuesday, February 5:

"Right here I want to stop to say that I congratulate the National Canners Association on the presentation by its Committee on Labelling of a fine report. You are on the right path and the Department of Agriculture is happy to see you moving in that direction."

consistently maintained. Furthermore, in November, 1944, the Board of Directors passed a resolution in which it took a firm position against mandatory grade labeling—expressed its belief that descriptive or specification labeling best served the consumer, adding that the Association and its Labeling Committee sought cooperation from and offered cooperation to all those who were interested in developing good labels in the consumer interest including those who voluntarily elected to use grade symbols on their own labels.

"Controversy was laid aside. We freed ourselves to spend our time in the orderly and constructive development of a sound labeling program of benefit to the consumer and thereby of benefit to ourselves.

"The attitude of many consumer leaders is growing that this program is based on sincere motives and that a descriptive or specification labeling formula is of genuine benefit to consumers. To a considerable extent, the present attitude toward this program is no longer critical as it once was. Instead the attitude of many in the consumer group is that we should be given every chance to do a good labeling job ourselves—voluntarily. The attitude goes even further in offers of encouragement and help.

"The development of this past year of great importance is that the major distributor associations have joined in formal approval of the label terms which are recommended.

"Last November the Board of Directors approved of the principle of a common label language and authorized the selection from among the several mandatory terms, which the Standards of Identity provide, of one term for all canners and distributors alike.

"In numerous cases, the Standards of Identity for canned and glassed fruits and vegetables provide several different terms (synonyms) for use on the label to state the same fact. One of the synonyms *must* be used.

"For example, the variety of peas must be stated but canned Alaska type peas may be indicated by one of three terms, *EARLY*, *EARLY JUNE*, or *JUNE*. If the industry will voluntarily unite on, and use, but one of these names on its labels, consumer confusion can be avoided.

"In these cases, selections of one term and recommendations for its use have been made by the N.C.A. Commodity Labeling Committees and the Distributors' Committee on Labeling.

"Recommended statements will be found in the first column. Other Optional statements in the second column":

PRODUCT NAMES

Recommended Statements	Other Optional Statements
FRUIT COCKTAIL.....	Cocktail Fruits or Fruits for Cocktails
LIMA BEANS.....	Butter Beans

PRODUCT NAMES—(Continued)	
Recommended Statements	Other Optional Statements
TOMATO PUREE.....	Tomato Pulp
CATSUP.....	Catchup or Ketchup
BLACKEYE PEAS.....	Blackeyed Peas
PIMENTOS.....	Pimientos
STYLE OF PACK	
(Fruits and Vegetables)	
HALVES.....	Halved
QUARTERS.....	Quartered
SLICED.....	Slice
DICED.....	Dice
STYLE OF PACK	
(Vegetables)	
FRENCH STYLE.....	Julienne or Shoestring
SPICE, FLAVORING	
(Fruits and Vegetables)	
SPICE ADDED.....	Spiced or With Added Spice
FLAVORING ADDED...With Added Flavoring	
ASPARAGUS	
SPEARS.....	Stalks
BEANS, GREEN AND WAX	
GREEN BEANS.....	Stringless Green Beans or Green Stringless Beans
WAX BEANS.....	Stringless Wax Beans
FRENCH STYLE.....	Shoestring or Julienne or Sliced Lengthwise
CHERRIES	
RED SOUR PITTED.....	Pitted Red Sour or Pitted Red Tart, or Red Tart Pitted
CORN	
WHITE SWEET CORN..	White Corn or White Sugar Corn
GOLDEN SWEET CORN.	Golden Corn or Golden Sugar Corn
WHOLE KERNEL.....	Whole Grain
CREAM STYLE.....	Crushed
PEACHES	
CLINGSTONE.....	Cling
FREESTONE.....	Free
PEANUTS	
EARLY.....	Early June or June
SWEET.....	Sweet Wrinkled or Sugar
TOMATOES	
WITH ADDED TOMATO	
JUICE.....	With Added Strained Tomatoes

The following resolution was unanimously passed by the Board of Directors:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors approves the report of The Committee on Labeling and specifically approves the labeling terms that have been selected and adopted by the Committee on Labeling and approved by the several distributor organizations. The Board of Directors urges upon every canner, distributor, and other organization directly or indirectly engaged in merchandising canned foods under their own labels and adoption and use at the earliest possible time of the recommended uniform labeling terms heretofore selected and adopted by The Committee on Labeling of the Association and approved by the Board of Directors.

REPORT ON CONTAINERS

By H. F. Krimendahl

It has been requested that I make an informal statement to the Board concerning the can size simplification program. You will remember that last November the Can Size Simplification Committee recommended in its report to the Board of Directors that the Association staff

"Should as promptly as possible consult with the staff of the Simplified Practice Division of The National Bureau of Standards to the end that appropriate information might be assembled to determine what, if any, revisions or additions or changes should be made for the immediate postwar period in the Simplified Practice Recommendation."

This recommendation was adopted by the Board which further authorized a cooperative survey of the canning industry to determine the adequacy of the can size list in the Simplified Practice Recommendation and likewise directed the Association staff to enlist in this work the cooperation of all State and regional canners organizations.

I am glad to report that this work has been begun and that the Association staff and the Bureau of Standards are at work on the problem of determining what list of cans will adequately serve the needs of the industry in the postwar period.

In the meantime, the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture has interested itself in the work toward simplification of container sizes and this subject was discussed at a meeting of the Planning Committee in Washington last week.

In an informal fashion, I should like to recommend to the Board of Directors that it by resolution direct the Can Size Simplification Committee, of which I have the honor to be Chairman, and the Association staff to broaden its efforts to work with this governmental agency as well as with the Bureau of Standards in this important endeavor.

Sauerkraut Canners Meeting

Sauerkraut canners met at the Ambassador Hotel, February 5, and outlined plans for the forthcoming advertising campaign to encourage the increased use of sauerkraut. President Alden C. Smith of the National Kraut Packers Association presided.

The group discussed the proposed descriptive labeling program for canned sauerkraut. In view of the recent restriction placed on the use of tin containers for canned sauerkraut, kraut packers were urged by government officials to market as much kraut in bulk as possible.

Raw Products Conferences

Raw Products Conferences were held on February 5 and 6, as scheduled, and in addition a third session was held on the evening of February 6, at the request of those in attendance. This attendance was unexpectedly large, especially in the representation of canners. Dr. Charles G. Woodbury, Director of the Association's Raw Products Bureau acted as chairman, and was assisted by Dr. Charles H. Mahoney, who will succeed to the post on Dr. Woodbury's retirement.

The invitation address on DDT, February 5, by Dr. Fred C. Bishopp, U. S. Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine (reproduced in full on page 56), was followed with keen interest and evoked animated discussion. The remaining time at that session was devoted to a review of the status of new sweet corn varieties and hybrids and a discussion of other production and pest control problems having to do with sweet corn and peas.

At the Conference on February 6 the invitation address was on chemical weed control, by Leonard Kephart of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. This paper appears in full on page 58. At the conclusion of his address the chairman called on Dr. H. C. Thompson, head of the Vegetable Industries Division at Cornell University who presented data on New York State experiments on successful control of weeds in carrot fields with certain oil sprays. Following Dr. Thompson's comments there was general discussion of the weed control problem including the adaptation to certain canning crops problems of the new type flame throwing devices used in some cotton growing areas in the south. The conference continued with a discussion of the variety trials of tomatoes and of the leading canning varieties in various parts of the country during which agricultural experiment station and canner representatives from New Jersey, Maryland, New York, Iowa and the mid-west placed before the conference the results of their tests and observations.

In connection with tomato problems the conference also considered tomato plant growing, including the possible advantages and disadvantages of obtaining plants from irrigated regions in the far west.

The evening session on February 6 was devoted largely to a discussion of problems of seed treatment for different canning crops and to a review of available information on new methods of harvesting asparagus by snapping instead of cutting.

At the beginning of each session the chairman explained that the information contributed by attending agricultural scientists was "off the record" and that no mimeographed summaries of the extemporaneous discussions would be available. Two prepared addresses, those by Mr. Kephart and Dr. Bishopp, are available. The Director of the Association's Raw Products Bureau, however, will be glad to put interested members in touch with available sources of information on any of the subjects discussed.

Canning Problems Conferences

Two Canning Problems Conferences were held during the Convention, arranged and conducted by National Canners Association Research Laboratory, with members of the Laboratory staff officiating and participating. These Conferences were attended by from 150 to 250 plant technologists, the attendance necessitating transfer of the meetings from rooms assigned to them in the Ambassador Hotel to larger quarters at the Chelsea.

The first Conference, on February 5, was presided over by H. K. Wilder, Assistant Director of the Western Branch Laboratory.

I. I. Somers, of the Association's San Francisco Laboratory, discussed the arrangement and operation of processing equipment necessary to insure that all containers receive the uniform amount of heat necessary for sterilization.

J. E. Hall of PictSweet Foods, Inc., Mt. Vernon, Wash., described the benefits that had been realized from the use of chlorinated water as a general supply for canning and freezing operations. The most striking result, according to Mr. Hall, was the greatly increased ease of maintaining equipment in a clean and sanitary condition.

Methods of measuring color and stating color characteristics numerically were described by Dr. A. Kramer of the University of Maryland, who also explained how color measurements are used as an indication of maturity or ripeness of fruits and vegetables.

C. L. Smith of the Research Department of the Continental Can Co. explained how the improper use of mechanical equipment for handling cans may lead to spoilage hazards and outlined the precautions necessary for eliminating these hazards.

The second Conference was held the afternoon of February 6, with C. A. Greenleaf, Assistant Director of the Washington Laboratory presiding, and opened with a discussion of possibili-

ties in electronic sterilization. This subject has caught the imagination of canning technologists who are impressed with the use of new electrical heating methods in other industries, for instance in bonding plywood for airplane construction. J. M. Jackson of the American Can Company's Research Department described experimental studies in electronic sterilization and explained the difficulties to be overcome before it can be applied commercially.

Dr. E. J. Cameron, Director of the Association's Washington Research Laboratory, discussed the effect of new methods of processing tomato juice on the amount of heating necessary for sterilization. Some of the newer methods, for instance, involve continuous sterilization at temperatures higher than the boiling point of water.

The final discussion was a three-part presentation of the research program on nutritive values in canned foods which has been supported for about four years by the National Canners Association and the Can Manufacturers Institute. Dr. R. W. Pilcher of the American Can Company related how the program came into existence and its place in the general picture of nutrition research. Dr. L. E. Clifcorn of the Continental Can Company gave a resume of the results thus far obtained and explained their significance in showing that canned foods retain the valuable nutrients of natural foods. Finally, Dr. J. R. Esty, Director of the National Canners Association San Francisco Laboratory, described the ways in which this information is being made known to the professions and the public through scientific papers, bulletins, and other channels of information.

N.C.A. Fisheries Conference

The N.C.A. Fisheries Conference was opened on February 5 by Association President Fred A. Stare, who presented E. M. Brennan of the P. E. Harris & Company, Chairman of the Canned Fish and Seafood Committee, who presided. Considerable interest was demonstrated in the program and a large representation of members who can fishery products was in attendance.

Arthur Paul, Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, made the principal address (reproduced in full on page 47). He presented a statement of policy on our international trade policy, indicating the position of fruit and vegetable and fish canners under it, and outlined its status in Congress and the recently established world government groups.

Noting an awakened Congressional and administrative interest in the fisheries, H. Thomas Austern, N.C.A. counsel, advised members to be constantly, constructively and critically aware of their activities. He discussed the status of the Wage-Hour bill, the Fisheries Proclamation, the Alaskan Indian claims, new proposals to the Alaska Fishing Regulations and various legislative matters affecting the fisheries. (See page 50.)

E. F. Phelps, Jr., speaking for Geoffrey Baker, Deputy Administrator on Price of the Office of Price Administration, presented background on the policy on canned fish, on fresh and frozen fish and on luxury or minor items for the coming season. (This statement will be sent to fish-canning members by special bulletin.)

A report on a survey of 1,200 housewives to discover why they did not serve canned fish more often was presented by Mrs. Barbara Daly Anderson, Director of the Consumers Service Bureau of The Parents Magazine, New York. (The report is presented in full on page 51.)

The effect upon American fisheries of the Food and Agricultural Organization and the backgrounds of the formation of the Fisheries Committee of that group was presented by A. W. Anderson, the American representative on the FAO Fisheries Committee. He is also chief of the Commercial Fisheries Division of the Fish and Wildlife Service. (See text of this address on page 54.)

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEET

The Association's Board of Directors held an all-day meeting on February 4, preceding the opening session of the Convention and took action—

Approving a proposal for the establishment in the Association of a Division of Foreign Trade to handle matters beyond the scope of an individual concern and confined to the Washington level and granting the Association's Foreign Trade Committee the right to determine the appropriate time at which such a Division should be activated.

Authorizing the President to appoint an Executive Committee of six members having the right to exercise all powers of the Board during the interim between meetings of the Board.

Approving the report of the Committee on Labeling and the labeling terms that Committee has selected and adopted.

Authorizing the President to appoint a special committee composed of not more than seven members of the Board to make a study of apportionment of representation on the Board and submit

recommendations at the next Board meeting.

Terminating all Committees other than those specifically provided for in the By-Laws and authorizing the appointment and reconstitution of the following Standing Committees: Adjustment, Consumer Complaints, Fishery Products, Home Economics, Labeling, Legislation, Raw Products, Resolutions, Scientific Research, Simplification of Containers, Statistics, Taxation, Traffic, and the following Special Committees: Building, Foreign Trade, Manpower, and Planning.

Adopting the Administrative Council's recommendation for continuance during 1946 of the current rate of membership dues—3/10ths of a cent per case on seasonal products and 3/20ths of a cent on non-seasonal.

Directing the Committee on Simplification of Containers to work with the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture and the Division of Simplified Practice of the National Bureau of Standards in its development of the industry program for simplification of container sizes.

Confirming the election of Marc C. Hutchinson to the Board of Trustees of the Pension Fund, succeeding E. B. Cosgrove, resigned.

Approving the report of the Protective Fund.

Reports of the Secretary and Treasurer were distributed at the opening of the Board meeting and their acceptance was voted.

Secretary Carlos Campbell explained the new 1946 budget, containing its change in budget classifications, and acceptance was moved and seconded. The budget proposes expenditures totaling \$706,012, leaving an operating fund estimated balance at the close of the year of \$510,487.10. The amounts compare with the budget estimate of \$705,229 for the past year and with 1945 expenditures totaling \$533,984.90.

The report of the Committee on Labeling was delivered by Happer Payne of the Association's Division of Labeling in the absence of Chairman Cosgrove. Full text is published on Page 64.

Chairman Herbert F. Krimendahl delivered the report of the Committee on Simplification of Containers and Stanley Powell the report of the Foreign Trade Committee. Action on both these reports is shown above.

Report of the Building Committee was made by Chairman G. Sherwin Haxton. It expressed a desire on the part of the Committee to further investigate building location sites and report at the May meeting of the Board.

Current legislative matters were reviewed in a report by Chairman Walter Graefe of the Legislative Committee. In addition to discussing the overall Congressional situation, the report specifically covered the present status of wage and hour, OPA, water pollution, school lunch and tax bills. Full text will be found on page 62.

Henry P. Taylor, Chairman of the Committee on Committees delivered his report, which was accepted, after discussion, and motion to place its recommendations into effect was passed. Full text of this report appears on page 63.

Reporting to the Board as Chairman of the Raw Products Committee, Herbert J. Barnes took this occasion to introduce to the Directors Dr. Charles H. Mahoney, who will become Director of the Association's Raw Products Bureau on the Retirement of Dr. Charles G. Woodbury.

Another report to the Board was that of the Scientific Research Committee, Harold Humphries, Chairman, who referred the members to the published Annual Report to the Research Committee of the two N.C.A. Laboratories.

Manpower Conference

A manpower conference was held at the Ambassador Hotel, February 4, at which time various government officials discussed the prospective manpower situation for this year with member-canners. Chairman John F. McGovern of the N.C.A. Manpower Committee presided.

The group learned that there will be no prisoner of war labor available this year and that the housing situation for all types of imported labor will be serious. USES officials stressed the importance of having an organized and correlated program to assure the orderly movement of interstate workers. USDA representatives outlined the present plans for importing Mexican workers.

A manpower conference room was provided at the Convention for canners to meet and discuss their individual problems with government manpower officials.

Annual Reports to be Mailed

Copies of the Secretary's Report for 1945, and the Annual Report to the Research Committee (1945) were distributed at the Convention and an additional copy is being mailed to each canner-member.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES

Several of the Association's Committees held meetings on the Friday and Saturday preceding the opening of the formal Convention program. In most cases action they took, or recommendations made, were passed on to either the Administrative Council meeting on Saturday afternoon or the Sunday session of the Board of Directors.

This was the procedure with regard to the Scientific Research Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee to the Labeling Committee and the Labeling Committee itself, the Legislative Committee, Raw Products Committee, and Building Committees. Reports of these groups will be found in the account of the proceedings of the Board of Directors meeting (page 67), or in cases where full, formal reports were written, are printed elsewhere in this issue of the LETTER.

The Home Economics Committee discussed the plans of that Division for 1946 and approved the preparation of three new booklets which will deal with quantity foods, household recipes, and nutritive values.

A meeting of the Statistical Committee was held February 5, and various problems in connection with the economic and statistical activities of the Association were discussed. A resolution was passed authorizing continuance of the pack reporting service on the present basis and extension of the stock reporting service to the commodities covered before the war.

Introducing Emil Rutz

Emil Rutz, elected first vice-president of the National Canners Association at its Atlantic City Convention, February 4, was born in 1899 at St. Gall, Switzerland. Following his education in the commercial school of that community, he spent two years in the Orient, in import and export business.

In 1921 Mr. Rutz came to San Francisco, spending two years with the Asiatic Bank. He became a naturalized American citizen at the required lapse of time.

In 1923 he joined Schuckl & Company, Sunnyvale, Calif., as office manager and rose successively through the post of treasurer and vice-president to become president in 1937.

His executive ability played a strong part in building the firm, which had started as a small institution, to one of the largest single units on the Coast. Schuckl now packs a full line of canned fruits and vegetables as well as such leading specialties as canned soups and

pork and beans. These are distributed by a wholly-owned subsidiary, the Sunnyvale Packing Company.

For the last two years Mr. Rutz was president, and is still a director of California Processors & Growers, Inc., a group representing about 80 percent of the total California pack. Also, he has been a director of the Canners League of California, and for N. C. A. has served on the Finance Committee, the Administrative Council and the Board of Directors.

M-81 Direction Enclosed

Enclosed with this issue of the INFORMATION LETTER is a copy of Direction 9 to the Tin Conservation Order, M-81, which was issued February 7 by the Civilian Production Administration and made available to the Association for distribution to canner-members and to the canning industry generally. Direction 9, a temporary order which has been placed in effect because of the steel strike and the shortage of tin, restricts the use of tin for packing certain items. For full understanding of the new provisions, Directive 9 must be read in conjunction with the text of Order M-81. Canners packing these restricted items may still obtain tin by making appeals through their can suppliers.

Other Association Officers

Officers of canning machinery, pickle packer, preserver, dehydrator, and food broker organizations, elected at their respective annual meetings last week in Atlantic City, are as follows:

Canning Machinery and Supplies Association

President—Roscoe M. Roberts, American Can Company, New York, N. Y.; vice president—Frank Fairbanks, Horix Manufacturing Company, Pittsburgh, Pa.; secretary-treasurer—S. G. Gorsline (re-elected for his 17th consecutive term).

National Food Brokers Association

President—Watson Rogers, Washington, D. C.; national chairman—J. O. Crawford, Los Angeles; first vice chairman—E. W. Peterson, Detroit, Mich.; second vice chairman—J. L. Gentry, Spartanburg, S. C.; third vice chairman—Ralph Davis, Cincinnati; treasurer—Harry E. Cook, Baltimore, Md.; member-at-large on the executive committee—E. W. Jones, Kansas City. Mr. Rogers, who formerly served as secre-

tary, was elected president under a new type of organization setup.

National Association of Frozen Food Packers

President—E. E. Huddleston, Stokely-Van Camp Co., Oakland, Calif.; first vice president—C. Courtney Seabrook, Deerfield Packing Corp., Bridgeton, N. J.; second vice-president—F. J. Becker, Gresham Berry Growers, Gresham, Ore.; secretary-treasurer—Lawrence S. Martin, Washington, D. C.; assistant secretary-treasurer—Keith O. Burr, Washington, D. C.

National Dehydrators Association

President—Graham Adams, Chicago, Ill.; vice-presidents—J. H. Hume, Basic Vegetable Products Co., Vacaville, Calif.; Russell Makepeace, A. D. Makepeace Co., Wareham, Mass.; O. L. Maxey, Deerfield Packing Corp., Bridgeton, N. J.; J. R. Simplot, J. R. Simplot Dehydrating Co., Caldwell, Idaho; Douglas M. Warriner, Warriner Starch Co., St. Francisville, La.; Silvain S. Wyler, Wyler and Co., Chicago, Ill.

National Preservers Association

President—George Senn, Senn Products Corp., Brooklyn, N. Y.; vice presidents—R. J. Glaser, Glaser, Crandell Co., Chicago, Ill.; L. F. Long, The Red Wing Company, Inc., Fredonia, N. Y.; T. N. St. Hill, Tea Garden Products Co., San Francisco, Calif.; secretary-treasurer—W. E. Smucker, The J. M. Smucker Co., Orrville, Ohio; and manager—M. L. Walde, Washington, D. C.

National Pickle Packers Association

President—Lewis A. Hirsch, Hirsch Bros., Louisville, Ky.; vice-president—H. L. Conley, Green Bay Foods, Green Bay, Wisconsin; secretary—E. T. Miller, Oak Park, Ill.; treasurer—C. J. Sutphen, Chicago, Ill.

Plant Sanitation, Waste Disposal

Methods of improving plant sanitation and disposal of canning wastes were discussed by speakers at the Thursday afternoon, February 7 Conference, at which R. E. Sanborn, of the California Packing Corp., presided.

H. K. Wilder, of the Association's Western Branch Laboratory, stressed the need for intelligent standards of plant illumination and described plans already adopted for developing these standards. C. W. Bohrer, of the Association's Washington Laboratory, led a discussion on cleaning problems in the canning plant and M. D. Pirnie, of Michigan State College, gave an illustrated statement on methods of rodent control. The final speaker, N. H. Sanborn, of the Association's Washington Laboratory, discussed the growing importance of waste disposal and described the various methods available.

SUSTAINED PRODUCTION (Concluded from page 38)

though gradual improvement in the supply situation is apparent.

On the question of what government takings of processed fruits and vegetables will amount to, the Secretary said that the Government's needs for canned vegetables from the 1946 pack, practically all for armed services, are expected to be roughly two-thirds of the take during the current season, but only about 15 percent of the large amounts acquired from the 1944-45 pack. Government's need for canned fruits, excluding citrus, are expected to be less than half of that required during the current season and only about one-tenth of the large amounts taken in the 1944-45 season.

Record Production Urged

"I am firmly convinced," stated Mr. Anderson, "that this is a time of great opportunity to build toward larger and better markets in the future. The end of this war finds the canning industry in a healthy state with a continuing high level of demand. The year 1946 will call for a peacetime record of production.

"One of the most important efforts toward maintaining your market will be to work for better quality. When consumers have plenty of money to spend they want the best. And they will be more insistent on good quality as supplies become more readily available in the stores.

"Canners who improve the quality of their product will benefit by putting on the label the information that the housewife wants." The Secretary interpolated in his prepared address a remark congratulating the Association on the report of its Committee on Labeling. (See page 64.) "You are on the right path and the Department of Agriculture is happy to see you moving in that direction," he asserted.

Flexible Pricing Program

Mr. Phelps presented the canners with a description of the 1946 OPA program based on two conditions—recognizing both possibilities—the continuance or the removal of subsidies.

If subsidy is authorized, the program will be as follows, he stated:

"We will continue all 1945 canner ceilings, as the basis for 1946 price levels, using Pricing Methods No. 1 and 2, as in 1945; then, particularly in the case of canned fruits, we will adjust ceilings upward to reflect increased sugar costs if such cost increases are larger than the inventory windfalls which some processors may realize when sugar prices are increased. The mechanics of the sugar problem

will have to be worked out, but I suggest you record your sugar inventory as of the date of the price increase—which is February 10."

To Reflect Increased Costs

In the event basic wage increases are approved with respect to the 1946 pack, Mr. Phelps stated, 1945 ceilings may have to be increased further, but since no increases of this nature have yet taken place, beyond those already recognized in present regulations, no advance recognition of estimated or possible increases will be authorized now. "However, if it becomes apparent that basic wage increases are approved in connection with the 1946 pack, the Stabilization Administrator will consider a method which would permit ceilings to be increased by an amount equal to the amount of direct cost increase occasioned by the wage rate increases."

Approved raw material increases also will be reflected in processor ceilings, he stated. "In the case of the subsidized vegetables, subsidy payments will be reduced if processors pay less than the designated grower prices, and, on the unsubsidized portion of the pack, or if there are no subsidies, we will provide for a reduction of ceilings if processors pay less than the designated grower prices."

If subsidy is withdrawn, he said, the program remains approximately the same, except that ceilings will be increased by the full amount of the subsidy expenditures involved.

And finally, whether subsidy is continued or withdrawn, OPA will continue to make minor corrections, the speaker said, such as those made throughout last year, wherever such action will not affect the average price level significantly. (Full text of Mr. Phelps' presentation of the OPA program is printed on page 44).

Other Elements of Program

Under Mr. Meyer's chairmanship the USDA portion of the N.C.A. program was next resumed with statements by Messrs. McCown, Fenn and Southerland. (These are reproduced on pages 46 and 47.)

Mr. McCown stated that as the season advances grower prices to be used in the calculation of processors' ceilings will be announced for the various fruits under control. He said that the level of probable procurement for government agencies in 1946 is now expected to be such that War Food Orders applicable to fruits will not be necessary. No support program applicable to fruits for canning is anticipated in 1946, he stated, and asserted his belief that export markets are expected to assume increasingly greater

importance in connection with utilization of fruit crops, and that promotion of foreign movement of processed, as well as fresh fruits must be an important marketing activity of USDA.

Mr. Fenn discussed the details of the schedule of designated prices for vegetables for canning and freezing, embodied in the USDA-OPA announcement. (See page 70.)

Mr. Southerland spoke about the program of establishing quality standards, and outlined the differences between the mandatory standards of identity and minimum standards of quality prescribed by the Food and Drug Administration and the voluntary standards established by USDA.

The balance of the N.C.A. program for the 1946 Convention, except for the closing session, the proceedings of which were reported above, consisted of Canning Problems Conferences, Raw Products Conferences, and a Fish Canners Conference. These, along with the meeting of the Board of Directors and several Committee meetings held just before the Convention opened, are reported on other pages of this issue.

CONVENTION SIDELIGHTS

(Concluded from page 31)

from the balcony of Convention Hall, interviewing Miss Marjorie Black, N.C.A. home economist, and sending news of the Convention and canning industry out over a national hookup.

Atlantic City luncheon clubs picked speakers from the N.C.A. roster—Fred Stare addressed the Exchange Club and Happen Payne the Kiwanians. . . . About 150 wives attended the buffet supper sponsored jointly by N.C.A. and C. M. & S. A. and held in the Venetian Room at Hotel Ambassador. . . . The Boardwalk influence was manifest in the number of families present. . . . Ed Phelps' departure from OPA was made public the same day he appeared on the N.C.A. program. . . . The Young Guard Society, made up of members of the canning and allied trades and junior to the Old Guard Society, held its annual banquet and get-together in Westminster Hall, Hotel Chelsea, on Monday night of Convention week. . . . A report to the nation on activities of the Convention was sent out over WBAB and CBS on the Country Journal program on Saturday after adjournment. . . . N.C.A. press facilities were more complete than usual, a correspondents' room with six direct telephone lines, four Morse sending lines, headquarters room for interviews and handouts, and workshop with mimeograph and typewriters.

CONGRESS SUMMARY

During Convention week the House passed the Case bill providing for a Labor-Management Mediation Board while the Senate by a vote of 48 yeas and 36 nays rejected a motion to invoke the cloture rule on S. 101, the Fair Employment Practices Bill, thereby leaving the measure on the Senate calendar where it is likely to remain for the remainder of the season.

House Agriculture Committee hearings on H. R. 4851, a bill to regulate and control the marketing of poisonous insecticides, fungicides, and rodenticides, were held during the week. Further action on the bill awaits consideration by the Committee in executive session.

The Case bill was passed by the House on February 7 by a vote of 258 to 155. The bill was adopted by the House after it had stricken the enactment clause of H. R. 4908, the measure reported to it by the Labor Committee.

Only one of President Truman's recommendations is contained in the bill approved by the House—the proposal for a 30-day cooling-off period. The bill ignores the request for fact-finding boards and for subpoena powers and the proposed Board would be forbidden the use of any confidential information on file with a government agency.

The Labor-Management Mediation Board to be established under the Case bill would be composed of an equal number of representatives of employees and employers in addition to public members. The Board would be composed of a minimum of six members. Jurisdiction of the Board would extend to labor disputes involving employers of more than 250 employees provided the dispute affects the public interest and involves interstate or foreign commerce. Disputes covered by the Railway Labor Act would not come within the Board's jurisdiction.

Collective bargaining agreements are protected in the bill by providing that either party to such an agreement may sue for damages in either State or U. S. District courts in case of a breach of contract. The bill also would modify the Norris-LaGuardia Act by authorizing the issuance of injunctions to stop picket-line violence and attempts to force workers to work or to quit their jobs. Under additional provisions of the measure, the Wagner Act would be amended to bar reinstatement and back pay to employees who

wilfully destroy property while engaged in a dispute or organizational work.

Other features of the bill would outlaw boycotts used to support jurisdictional disputes and ban foremen's unions. Labor organizations found to have violated the boycott prohibition would be denied recognition under the Wagner Act for a period of not less

than 90 days nor more than six months.

The report of the Association's Legislative Committee made by Chairman Walter Graefe at the meeting of the Board of Directors on February 3 will be found on page 62. Chairman Graefe's report fully summarized the status as the Convention opened of legislation in which the industry is most interested.

1946 Program for Processed Vegetables Announced by USDA and OPA

The U. S. Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration on February 2 announced the area average designated prices for vegetables for processing which will provide the raw material cost basis to be used by the OPA in computing maximum prices for the 1946 packs of canned and frozen vegetables. At the same time, the Department of Agriculture announced that grower prices for vegetables for processing and processed vegetables would not be supported in 1946. The designated prices were approved by Stabilization Administrator Judge John C. Collet.

Prices of sweet corn and green peas for canning and freezing and tomatoes for canning are the same as the area average grower prices approved for these vegetables in 1945.

The new schedule of area average designated prices includes an increase of \$5 per ton for fresh lima beans for processing, and an increase of 8 cents per bushel from the prices originally announced for 1945 for cucumbers. Both price changes were necessary to meet legal requirements.

No prices have been designated for carrots and sweet potatoes for canning and cabbage for sauerkraut since these vegetables are presently exempted or suspended from price control. Likewise, no prices have been designated for snap beans, fresh shelled beans, and beets, for processing, since the 1946 packs of these commodities also will be suspended from price control.

In order that growers and processors may be able to proceed in an orderly

manner in contracting raw vegetables for the 1946 production of canned and frozen vegetables, the USDA and OPA also announced that with respect to those vegetables which were subsidized in 1945 and which remain under price control in 1946, the same gross maximum prices will be continued, either by continuing subsidy payments or by making adjustments in the civilian maximum prices for the amount of the subsidy. In this connection, the USDA and OPA have been advised by John C. Collet that subsidies will be continued if Congress appropriates the necessary funds.

The details of the 1946 pricing program for processors were announced by OPA at the Convention. (See "OPA's Program for the 1946 Pack of Processed Fruits and Vegetables" by E. F. Phelps, Jr., OPA price executive, on page 44.)

In respect to tomatoes, and tomato products, the present subsidy program is being extended to include packs produced through February 28, 1946.

The 1946 prices listed in the following tables are on an area average or field run basis and are for vegetables delivered to the plant or major assembly point, whichever has been used customarily by growers, canners, or freezers. Since only the area average (or field run) price for a vegetable is used in determining raw material costs to be reflected in ceiling prices, no detailed breakdown of these prices by size, grade, or variety of any of the vegetables will be provided.

Designated Area Average Prices for Canning

	Price per ton
ASPARAGUS	
Oregon and Washington 1.....	1942 price plus \$ 40.00
All other States 1.....	1942 price plus 30.00
BEANS, FRESH, LIMA, OTHER THAN FORDHOOK TYPE	
Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho other than Southeastern 2.....	120.00
New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia (Eastern Shore) 3, Utah, Wyoming, and Idaho (Southeastern) 3.....	105.00
All other States and areas.....	100.00
CORN, SWEET	
Mains and New Hampshire.....	28.00
Vermont.....	22.00
New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Illinois, Indiana, and Central and Eastern Iowa 4.....	10.00
Washington, Oregon, Northwestern Utah 4 and Northern 4 and Southwestern Idaho 5.....	23.00
All other States and counties.....	17.00

¹ These are in the South
² Eastern
³ Central
⁴ FAY
⁵ WASH
⁶ North
⁷ South
⁸ West
⁹ Middle
¹⁰ New England
¹¹ New Jersey
¹² Rhode Island
¹³ New York
¹⁴ Pennsylvania
¹⁵ Virginia
¹⁶ Maryland
¹⁷ Delaware
¹⁸ Connecticut
¹⁹ Massachusetts
²⁰ New Hampshire
²¹ Vermont
²² New York
²³ New Jersey
²⁴ Pennsylvania
²⁵ Virginia
²⁶ Maryland
²⁷ Delaware
²⁸ Connecticut
²⁹ Massachusetts
³⁰ New Hampshire
³¹ Vermont
³² New York
³³ New Jersey
³⁴ Pennsylvania
³⁵ Virginia
³⁶ Maryland
³⁷ Delaware
³⁸ Connecticut
³⁹ Massachusetts
⁴⁰ New Hampshire
⁴¹ Vermont
⁴² New York
⁴³ New Jersey
⁴⁴ Pennsylvania
⁴⁵ Virginia
⁴⁶ Maryland
⁴⁷ Delaware
⁴⁸ Connecticut
⁴⁹ Massachusetts
⁵⁰ New Hampshire
⁵¹ Vermont
⁵² New York
⁵³ New Jersey
⁵⁴ Pennsylvania
⁵⁵ Virginia
⁵⁶ Maryland
⁵⁷ Delaware
⁵⁸ Connecticut
⁵⁹ Massachusetts
⁶⁰ New Hampshire
⁶¹ Vermont
⁶² New York
⁶³ New Jersey
⁶⁴ Pennsylvania
⁶⁵ Virginia
⁶⁶ Maryland
⁶⁷ Delaware
⁶⁸ Connecticut
⁶⁹ Massachusetts
⁷⁰ New Hampshire
⁷¹ Vermont
⁷² New York
⁷³ New Jersey
⁷⁴ Pennsylvania
⁷⁵ Virginia
⁷⁶ Maryland
⁷⁷ Delaware
⁷⁸ Connecticut
⁷⁹ Massachusetts
⁸⁰ New Hampshire
⁸¹ Vermont
⁸² New York
⁸³ New Jersey
⁸⁴ Pennsylvania
⁸⁵ Virginia
⁸⁶ Maryland
⁸⁷ Delaware
⁸⁸ Connecticut
⁸⁹ Massachusetts
⁹⁰ New Hampshire
⁹¹ Vermont
⁹² New York
⁹³ New Jersey
⁹⁴ Pennsylvania
⁹⁵ Virginia
⁹⁶ Maryland
⁹⁷ Delaware
⁹⁸ Connecticut
⁹⁹ Massachusetts
¹⁰⁰ New Hampshire
¹⁰¹ Vermont
¹⁰² New York
¹⁰³ New Jersey
¹⁰⁴ Pennsylvania
¹⁰⁵ Virginia
¹⁰⁶ Maryland
¹⁰⁷ Delaware
¹⁰⁸ Connecticut
¹⁰⁹ Massachusetts
¹¹⁰ New Hampshire
¹¹¹ Vermont
¹¹² New York
¹¹³ New Jersey
¹¹⁴ Pennsylvania
¹¹⁵ Virginia
¹¹⁶ Maryland
¹¹⁷ Delaware
¹¹⁸ Connecticut
¹¹⁹ Massachusetts
¹²⁰ New Hampshire
¹²¹ Vermont
¹²² New York
¹²³ New Jersey
¹²⁴ Pennsylvania
¹²⁵ Virginia
¹²⁶ Maryland
¹²⁷ Delaware
¹²⁸ Connecticut
¹²⁹ Massachusetts
¹³⁰ New Hampshire
¹³¹ Vermont
¹³² New York
¹³³ New Jersey
¹³⁴ Pennsylvania
¹³⁵ Virginia
¹³⁶ Maryland
¹³⁷ Delaware
¹³⁸ Connecticut
¹³⁹ Massachusetts
¹⁴⁰ New Hampshire
¹⁴¹ Vermont
¹⁴² New York
¹⁴³ New Jersey
¹⁴⁴ Pennsylvania
¹⁴⁵ Virginia
¹⁴⁶ Maryland
¹⁴⁷ Delaware
¹⁴⁸ Connecticut
¹⁴⁹ Massachusetts
¹⁵⁰ New Hampshire
¹⁵¹ Vermont
¹⁵² New York
¹⁵³ New Jersey
¹⁵⁴ Pennsylvania
¹⁵⁵ Virginia
¹⁵⁶ Maryland
¹⁵⁷ Delaware
¹⁵⁸ Connecticut
¹⁵⁹ Massachusetts
¹⁶⁰ New Hampshire
¹⁶¹ Vermont
¹⁶² New York
¹⁶³ New Jersey
¹⁶⁴ Pennsylvania
¹⁶⁵ Virginia
¹⁶⁶ Maryland
¹⁶⁷ Delaware
¹⁶⁸ Connecticut
¹⁶⁹ Massachusetts
¹⁷⁰ New Hampshire
¹⁷¹ Vermont
¹⁷² New York
¹⁷³ New Jersey
¹⁷⁴ Pennsylvania
¹⁷⁵ Virginia
¹⁷⁶ Maryland
¹⁷⁷ Delaware
¹⁷⁸ Connecticut
¹⁷⁹ Massachusetts
¹⁸⁰ New Hampshire
¹⁸¹ Vermont
¹⁸² New York
¹⁸³ New Jersey
¹⁸⁴ Pennsylvania
¹⁸⁵ Virginia
¹⁸⁶ Maryland
¹⁸⁷ Delaware
¹⁸⁸ Connecticut
¹⁸⁹ Massachusetts
¹⁹⁰ New Hampshire
¹⁹¹ Vermont
¹⁹² New York
¹⁹³ New Jersey
¹⁹⁴ Pennsylvania
¹⁹⁵ Virginia
¹⁹⁶ Maryland
¹⁹⁷ Delaware
¹⁹⁸ Connecticut
¹⁹⁹ Massachusetts
²⁰⁰ New Hampshire
²⁰¹ Vermont
²⁰² New York
²⁰³ New Jersey
²⁰⁴ Pennsylvania
²⁰⁵ Virginia
²⁰⁶ Maryland
²⁰⁷ Delaware
²⁰⁸ Connecticut
²⁰⁹ Massachusetts
²¹⁰ New Hampshire
²¹¹ Vermont
²¹² New York
²¹³ New Jersey
²¹⁴ Pennsylvania
²¹⁵ Virginia
²¹⁶ Maryland
²¹⁷ Delaware
²¹⁸ Connecticut
²¹⁹ Massachusetts
²²⁰ New Hampshire
²²¹ Vermont
²²² New York
²²³ New Jersey
²²⁴ Pennsylvania
²²⁵ Virginia
²²⁶ Maryland
²²⁷ Delaware
²²⁸ Connecticut
²²⁹ Massachusetts
²³⁰ New Hampshire
²³¹ Vermont
²³² New York
²³³ New Jersey
²³⁴ Pennsylvania
²³⁵ Virginia
²³⁶ Maryland
²³⁷ Delaware
²³⁸ Connecticut
²³⁹ Massachusetts
²⁴⁰ New Hampshire
²⁴¹ Vermont
²⁴² New York
²⁴³ New Jersey
²⁴⁴ Pennsylvania
²⁴⁵ Virginia
²⁴⁶ Maryland
²⁴⁷ Delaware
²⁴⁸ Connecticut
²⁴⁹ Massachusetts
²⁵⁰ New Hampshire
²⁵¹ Vermont
²⁵² New York
²⁵³ New Jersey
²⁵⁴ Pennsylvania
²⁵⁵ Virginia
²⁵⁶ Maryland
²⁵⁷ Delaware
²⁵⁸ Connecticut
²⁵⁹ Massachusetts
²⁶⁰ New Hampshire
²⁶¹ Vermont
²⁶² New York
²⁶³ New Jersey
²⁶⁴ Pennsylvania
²⁶⁵ Virginia
²⁶⁶ Maryland
²⁶⁷ Delaware
²⁶⁸ Connecticut
²⁶⁹ Massachusetts
²⁷⁰ New Hampshire
²⁷¹ Vermont
²⁷² New York
²⁷³ New Jersey
²⁷⁴ Pennsylvania
²⁷⁵ Virginia
²⁷⁶ Maryland
²⁷⁷ Delaware
²⁷⁸ Connecticut
²⁷⁹ Massachusetts
²⁸⁰ New Hampshire
²⁸¹ Vermont
²⁸² New York
²⁸³ New Jersey
²⁸⁴ Pennsylvania
²⁸⁵ Virginia
²⁸⁶ Maryland
²⁸⁷ Delaware
²⁸⁸ Connecticut
²⁸⁹ Massachusetts
²⁹⁰ New Hampshire
²⁹¹ Vermont
²⁹² New York
²⁹³ New Jersey
²⁹⁴ Pennsylvania
²⁹⁵ Virginia
²⁹⁶ Maryland
²⁹⁷ Delaware
²⁹⁸ Connecticut
²⁹⁹ Massachusetts
³⁰⁰ New Hampshire
³⁰¹ Vermont
³⁰² New York
³⁰³ New Jersey
³⁰⁴ Pennsylvania
³⁰⁵ Virginia
³⁰⁶ Maryland
³⁰⁷ Delaware
³⁰⁸ Connecticut
³⁰⁹ Massachusetts
³¹⁰ New Hampshire
³¹¹ Vermont
³¹² New York
³¹³ New Jersey
³¹⁴ Pennsylvania
³¹⁵ Virginia
³¹⁶ Maryland
³¹⁷ Delaware
³¹⁸ Connecticut
³¹⁹ Massachusetts
³²⁰ New Hampshire
³²¹ Vermont
³²² New York
³²³ New Jersey
³²⁴ Pennsylvania
³²⁵ Virginia
³²⁶ Maryland
³²⁷ Delaware
³²⁸ Connecticut
³²⁹ Massachusetts
³³⁰ New Hampshire
³³¹ Vermont
³³² New York
³³³ New Jersey
³³⁴ Pennsylvania
³³⁵ Virginia
³³⁶ Maryland
³³⁷ Delaware
³³⁸ Connecticut
³³⁹ Massachusetts
³⁴⁰ New Hampshire
³⁴¹ Vermont
³⁴² New York
³⁴³ New Jersey
³⁴⁴ Pennsylvania
³⁴⁵ Virginia
³⁴⁶ Maryland
³⁴⁷ Delaware
³⁴⁸ Connecticut
³⁴⁹ Massachusetts
³⁵⁰ New Hampshire
³⁵¹ Vermont
³⁵² New York
³⁵³ New Jersey
³⁵⁴ Pennsylvania
³⁵⁵ Virginia
³⁵⁶ Maryland
³⁵⁷ Delaware
³⁵⁸ Connecticut
³⁵⁹ Massachusetts
³⁶⁰ New Hampshire
³⁶¹ Vermont
³⁶² New York
³⁶³ New Jersey
³⁶⁴ Pennsylvania
³⁶⁵ Virginia
³⁶⁶ Maryland
³⁶⁷ Delaware
³⁶⁸ Connecticut
³⁶⁹ Massachusetts
³⁷⁰ New Hampshire
³⁷¹ Vermont
³⁷² New York
³⁷³ New Jersey
³⁷⁴ Pennsylvania
³⁷⁵ Virginia
³⁷⁶ Maryland
³⁷⁷ Delaware
³⁷⁸ Connecticut
³⁷⁹ Massachusetts
³⁸⁰ New Hampshire
³⁸¹ Vermont
³⁸² New York
³⁸³ New Jersey
³⁸⁴ Pennsylvania
³⁸⁵ Virginia
³⁸⁶ Maryland
³⁸⁷ Delaware
³⁸⁸ Connecticut
³⁸⁹ Massachusetts
³⁹⁰ New Hampshire
³⁹¹ Vermont
³⁹² New York
³⁹³ New Jersey
³⁹⁴ Pennsylvania
³⁹⁵ Virginia
³⁹⁶ Maryland
³⁹⁷ Delaware
³⁹⁸ Connecticut
³⁹⁹ Massachusetts
⁴⁰⁰ New Hampshire
⁴⁰¹ Vermont
⁴⁰² New York
⁴⁰³ New Jersey
⁴⁰⁴ Pennsylvania
⁴⁰⁵ Virginia
⁴⁰⁶ Maryland
⁴⁰⁷ Delaware
⁴⁰⁸ Connecticut
⁴⁰⁹ Massachusetts
⁴¹⁰ New Hampshire
⁴¹¹ Vermont
⁴¹² New York
⁴¹³ New Jersey
⁴¹⁴ Pennsylvania
⁴¹⁵ Virginia
⁴¹⁶ Maryland
⁴¹⁷ Delaware
⁴¹⁸ Connecticut
⁴¹⁹ Massachusetts
⁴²⁰ New Hampshire
⁴²¹ Vermont
⁴²² New York
⁴²³ New Jersey
⁴²⁴ Pennsylvania
⁴²⁵ Virginia
⁴²⁶ Maryland
⁴²⁷ Delaware
⁴²⁸ Connecticut
⁴²⁹ Massachusetts
⁴³⁰ New Hampshire
⁴³¹ Vermont
⁴³² New York
⁴³³ New Jersey
⁴³⁴ Pennsylvania
⁴³⁵ Virginia
⁴³⁶ Maryland
⁴³⁷ Delaware
⁴³⁸ Connecticut
⁴³⁹ Massachusetts
⁴⁴⁰ New Hampshire
⁴⁴¹ Vermont
⁴⁴² New York
⁴⁴³ New Jersey
⁴⁴⁴ Pennsylvania
⁴⁴⁵ Virginia
⁴⁴⁶ Maryland
⁴⁴⁷ Delaware
⁴⁴⁸ Connecticut
⁴⁴⁹ Massachusetts
⁴⁵⁰ New Hampshire
⁴⁵¹ Vermont
⁴⁵² New York
⁴⁵³ New Jersey
⁴⁵⁴ Pennsylvania
⁴⁵⁵ Virginia
⁴⁵⁶ Maryland
⁴⁵⁷ Delaware
⁴⁵⁸ Connecticut
⁴⁵⁹ Massachusetts
⁴⁶⁰ New Hampshire
⁴⁶¹ Vermont
⁴⁶² New York
⁴⁶³ New Jersey
⁴⁶⁴ Pennsylvania
⁴⁶⁵ Virginia
⁴⁶⁶ Maryland
⁴⁶⁷ Delaware
⁴⁶⁸ Connecticut
⁴⁶⁹ Massachusetts
⁴⁷⁰ New Hampshire
⁴⁷¹ Vermont
⁴⁷² New York
⁴⁷³ New Jersey
⁴⁷⁴ Pennsylvania
⁴⁷⁵ Virginia
⁴⁷⁶ Maryland
⁴⁷⁷ Delaware
⁴⁷⁸ Connecticut
⁴⁷⁹ Massachusetts
⁴⁸⁰ New Hampshire
⁴⁸¹ Vermont
⁴⁸² New York
⁴⁸³ New Jersey
⁴⁸⁴ Pennsylvania
⁴⁸⁵ Virginia
⁴⁸⁶ Maryland
⁴⁸⁷ Delaware
⁴⁸⁸ Connecticut
⁴⁸⁹ Massachusetts
⁴⁹⁰ New Hampshire
⁴⁹¹ Vermont
⁴⁹² New York
⁴⁹³ New Jersey
⁴⁹⁴ Pennsylvania
⁴⁹⁵ Virginia
⁴⁹⁶ Maryland
⁴⁹⁷ Delaware
⁴⁹⁸ Connecticut
⁴⁹⁹ Massachusetts
⁵⁰⁰ New Hampshire
⁵⁰¹ Vermont
⁵⁰² New York
⁵⁰³ New Jersey
⁵⁰⁴ Pennsylvania
⁵⁰⁵ Virginia
⁵⁰⁶ Maryland
⁵⁰⁷ Delaware
⁵⁰⁸ Connecticut
⁵⁰⁹ Massachusetts
⁵¹⁰ New Hampshire
⁵¹¹ Vermont
⁵¹² New York
⁵¹³ New Jersey
⁵¹⁴ Pennsylvania
⁵¹⁵ Virginia
⁵¹⁶ Maryland
⁵¹⁷ Delaware
⁵¹⁸ Connecticut
⁵¹⁹ Massachusetts
⁵²⁰ New Hampshire
⁵²¹ Vermont
⁵²² New York
⁵²³ New Jersey
⁵²⁴ Pennsylvania
⁵²⁵ Virginia
⁵²⁶ Maryland
⁵²⁷ Delaware
⁵²⁸ Connecticut
⁵²⁹ Massachusetts
⁵³⁰ New Hampshire
⁵³¹ Vermont
⁵³² New York
⁵³³ New Jersey
⁵³⁴ Pennsylvania
⁵³⁵ Virginia
⁵³⁶ Maryland
⁵³⁷ Delaware
⁵³⁸ Connecticut
⁵³⁹ Massachusetts
⁵⁴⁰ New Hampshire
⁵⁴¹ Vermont
⁵⁴² New York
⁵⁴³ New Jersey
⁵⁴⁴ Pennsylvania
⁵⁴⁵ Virginia
⁵⁴⁶ Maryland
⁵⁴⁷ Delaware
⁵⁴⁸ Connecticut
⁵⁴⁹ Massachusetts
⁵⁵⁰ New Hampshire
⁵⁵¹ Vermont
⁵⁵² New York
⁵⁵³ New Jersey
⁵⁵⁴ Pennsylvania
⁵⁵⁵ Virginia
⁵⁵⁶ Maryland
⁵⁵⁷ Delaware
⁵⁵⁸ Connecticut
⁵⁵⁹ Massachusetts
⁵⁶⁰ New Hampshire
⁵⁶¹ Vermont
⁵⁶² New York
⁵⁶³ New Jersey
⁵⁶⁴ Pennsylvania
⁵⁶⁵ Virginia
⁵⁶⁶ Maryland
⁵⁶⁷ Delaware
⁵⁶⁸ Connecticut
⁵⁶⁹ Massachusetts
⁵⁷⁰ New Hampshire
⁵⁷¹ Vermont
⁵⁷² New York
⁵⁷³ New Jersey
⁵⁷⁴ Pennsylvania
⁵⁷⁵ Virginia
⁵⁷⁶ Maryland
⁵⁷⁷ Delaware
⁵⁷⁸ Connecticut
⁵⁷⁹ Massachusetts
⁵⁸⁰ New Hampshire
⁵⁸¹ Vermont
⁵⁸² New York
⁵⁸³ New Jersey
⁵⁸⁴ Pennsylvania
⁵⁸⁵ Virginia
⁵⁸⁶ Maryland
⁵⁸⁷ Delaware
⁵⁸⁸ Connecticut
⁵⁸⁹ Massachusetts
⁵⁹⁰ New Hampshire
⁵⁹¹ Vermont
⁵⁹² New York
⁵⁹³ New Jersey
⁵⁹⁴ Pennsylvania
⁵⁹⁵ Virginia
⁵⁹⁶ Maryland
⁵⁹⁷ Delaware
⁵⁹⁸ Connecticut
⁵⁹⁹ Massachusetts
⁶⁰⁰ New Hampshire
⁶⁰¹ Vermont
⁶⁰² New York
⁶⁰³ New Jersey
⁶⁰⁴ Pennsylvania
⁶⁰⁵ Virginia
⁶⁰⁶ Maryland
⁶⁰⁷ Delaware
⁶⁰⁸ Connecticut
⁶⁰⁹ Massachusetts
⁶¹⁰ New Hampshire
⁶¹¹ Vermont
⁶¹² New York
⁶¹³ New Jersey
⁶¹⁴ Pennsylvania
⁶¹⁵ Virginia
⁶¹⁶ Maryland
⁶¹⁷ Delaware
⁶¹⁸ Connecticut
⁶¹⁹ Massachusetts
⁶²⁰ New Hampshire
⁶²¹ Vermont
⁶²² New York
⁶²³ New Jersey
⁶²⁴ Pennsylvania
⁶²⁵ Virginia
⁶²⁶ Maryland
⁶²⁷ Delaware
⁶²⁸ Connecticut
⁶²⁹ Massachusetts
⁶³⁰ New Hampshire
⁶³¹ Vermont
⁶³² New York
⁶³³ New Jersey
⁶³⁴ Pennsylvania
⁶³⁵ Virginia
⁶³⁶ Maryland
⁶³⁷ Delaware
⁶³⁸ Connecticut
⁶³⁹ Massachusetts
⁶⁴⁰ New Hampshire
⁶⁴¹ Vermont
⁶⁴² New York
⁶⁴³ New Jersey
⁶⁴⁴ Pennsylvania
⁶⁴⁵ Virginia
⁶⁴⁶ Maryland
⁶⁴⁷ Delaware
⁶⁴⁸ Connecticut
⁶⁴⁹ Massachusetts
⁶⁵⁰ New Hampshire
⁶⁵¹ Vermont
⁶⁵² New York
⁶⁵³ New Jersey
⁶⁵⁴ Pennsylvania
⁶⁵⁵ Virginia
⁶⁵⁶ Maryland
⁶⁵⁷ Delaware
⁶⁵⁸ Connecticut
⁶⁵⁹ Massachusetts
⁶⁶⁰ New Hampshire
⁶⁶¹ Vermont
⁶⁶² New York
⁶⁶³ New Jersey
⁶⁶⁴ Pennsylvania
⁶⁶⁵ Virginia
⁶⁶⁶ Maryland
⁶⁶⁷ Delaware
⁶⁶⁸ Connecticut
⁶⁶⁹ Massachusetts
⁶⁷⁰ New Hampshire
⁶⁷¹ Vermont
⁶⁷² New York
⁶⁷³ New Jersey
⁶⁷⁴ Pennsylvania
⁶⁷⁵ Virginia
⁶⁷⁶ Maryland
⁶⁷⁷ Delaware
⁶⁷⁸ Connecticut
⁶⁷⁹ Massachusetts
⁶⁸⁰ New Hampshire
⁶⁸¹ Vermont
⁶⁸² New York
⁶⁸³ New Jersey
⁶⁸⁴ Pennsylvania
⁶⁸⁵ Virginia
⁶⁸⁶ Maryland
⁶⁸⁷ Delaware
⁶⁸⁸ Connecticut
⁶⁸⁹ Massachusetts
⁶⁹⁰ New Hampshire
⁶⁹¹ Vermont
⁶⁹² New York
⁶⁹³ New Jersey
⁶⁹⁴ Pennsylvania
⁶⁹⁵ Virginia
⁶⁹⁶ Maryland
⁶⁹⁷ Delaware
⁶⁹⁸ Connecticut
⁶⁹⁹ Massachusetts
⁷⁰⁰ New Hampshire
⁷⁰¹ Vermont
⁷⁰² New York
⁷⁰³ New Jersey
⁷⁰⁴ Pennsylvania
⁷⁰⁵ Virginia
⁷⁰⁶ Maryland
⁷⁰⁷ Delaware
⁷⁰⁸ Connecticut
⁷⁰⁹ Massachusetts
⁷¹⁰ New Hampshire
⁷¹¹ Vermont
⁷¹² New York
⁷¹³ New Jersey
⁷¹⁴ Pennsylvania
⁷¹⁵ Virginia
⁷¹⁶ Maryland
⁷¹⁷ Delaware
⁷¹⁸ Connecticut
⁷¹⁹ Massachusetts
⁷²⁰ New Hampshire
⁷²¹ Vermont
⁷²² New York
⁷²³ New Jersey
⁷²⁴ Pennsylvania
⁷²⁵ Virginia
⁷²⁶ Maryland
⁷²⁷ Delaware
⁷²⁸ Connecticut
⁷²⁹ Massachusetts
⁷³⁰ New Hampshire
⁷³¹ Vermont
⁷³² New York
⁷³³ New Jersey
⁷³⁴ Pennsylvania
⁷³⁵ Virginia
⁷³⁶ Maryland
⁷³⁷ Delaware
⁷³⁸ Connecticut
⁷³⁹ Massachusetts
⁷⁴⁰ New Hampshire
⁷⁴¹ Vermont
⁷⁴² New York
⁷⁴³ New Jersey
⁷⁴⁴ Pennsylvania
⁷⁴⁵ Virginia
⁷⁴⁶ Maryland
⁷⁴⁷ Delaware
⁷⁴⁸ Connecticut
⁷⁴⁹ Massachusetts
⁷⁵⁰ New Hampshire
⁷⁵¹ Vermont
⁷⁵² New York
⁷⁵³ New Jersey
⁷⁵⁴ Pennsylvania
⁷⁵⁵ Virginia
⁷⁵⁶ Maryland
⁷⁵⁷ Delaware
⁷⁵⁸ Connecticut
⁷⁵⁹ Massachusetts
⁷⁶⁰ New Hampshire
⁷⁶¹ Vermont
⁷⁶² New York
⁷⁶³ New Jersey
⁷⁶⁴ Pennsylvania
⁷⁶⁵ Virginia
⁷⁶⁶ Maryland
⁷⁶⁷ Delaware
⁷⁶⁸ Connecticut
⁷⁶⁹ Massachusetts
⁷⁷⁰ New Hampshire
⁷⁷¹ Vermont
⁷⁷² New York
⁷⁷³ New Jersey
⁷⁷⁴ Pennsylvania
⁷⁷⁵ Virginia
⁷⁷⁶ Maryland
⁷⁷⁷ Delaware
⁷⁷⁸ Connecticut
⁷⁷⁹ Massachusetts
⁷⁸⁰ New Hampshire
⁷⁸¹ Vermont
⁷⁸² New York
⁷⁸³ New Jersey
⁷⁸⁴ Pennsylvania
⁷⁸⁵ Virginia
⁷⁸⁶ Maryland
⁷⁸⁷ Delaware
⁷⁸⁸ Connecticut
⁷⁸⁹ Massachusetts
⁷⁹⁰ New Hampshire
⁷⁹¹ Vermont
⁷⁹² New York
⁷⁹³ New Jersey
⁷⁹⁴ Pennsylvania
⁷⁹⁵ Virginia
⁷⁹⁶ Maryland
⁷⁹⁷ Delaware
⁷⁹⁸ Connecticut
⁷⁹⁹ Massachusetts
⁸⁰⁰ New Hampshire
⁸⁰¹ Vermont
⁸⁰² New York
⁸⁰³ New Jersey
⁸⁰⁴ Pennsylvania
⁸⁰⁵ Virginia
⁸⁰⁶ Maryland
⁸⁰⁷ Delaware
⁸⁰⁸ Connecticut
⁸⁰⁹ Massachusetts
⁸¹⁰ New Hampshire
⁸¹¹ Vermont
⁸¹² New York
⁸¹³ New Jersey
⁸¹⁴ Pennsylvania
⁸¹⁵ Virginia
⁸¹⁶ Maryland
⁸¹⁷ Delaware
⁸¹⁸ Connecticut
⁸¹⁹ Massachusetts
⁸²⁰ New Hampshire
⁸²¹ Vermont
⁸²² New York
⁸²³ New Jersey
⁸²⁴ Pennsylvania
⁸²⁵ Virginia
⁸²⁶ Maryland
⁸²⁷ Delaware
⁸²⁸ Connecticut
⁸²⁹ Massachusetts
⁸³⁰ New Hampshire
⁸³

CUCUMBERS, FRESH, FOR PICKLES		Price per ton
Details to be announced.	MUSHROOMS	
All States, per 3-lb. basket.	PEAS, GREEN	1.50
Delaware and Maryland.		91.00
New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania.		90.50
Virginia.		89.50
Washington, Western.		88.00
Maine.		88.50
New York.		88.00
New Jersey, Iowa (except Southwestern), West Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky and Tennessee.		86.00
Illinois and Southwestern Wisconsin.		85.00
Minnesota, Northwestern Wisconsin, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina.		82.50
Arkansas.		81.00
Ohio.		80.50
Oregon (except Malheur County), Washington (other than Western), and Northern Idaho.		79.00
Michigan, Texas, Utah, and Southeastern Idaho.		78.50
Indiana, Southwestern Idaho, Malheur County in Oregon.		77.50
Missouri, Southwestern Iowa, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Kansas.		76.50
Arizona and Nevada.		76.00
California, Colorado, and Montana.		74.00
South Dakota and North Dakota.		73.50
Wyoming.		73.00
New Mexico.		71.00

PEAS, BLACK-EYE, IN PODS		Price per ton
Maryland and Virginia.		
All other States east of the Mississippi River.		60.00
All States west of the Mississippi River including all of Louisiana.		55.00
		65.00

PEAS, OTHER FIELD, IN POD		Price per ton
(Including crowder, cream, purple hulls and other similar varieties used for canning)		
Maryland and Virginia.		55.00
All other States east of the Mississippi River.		50.00
All States west of the Mississippi River including all of Louisiana.		65.00

SPINACH		Price per ton
Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania other than Northern, cut below crown.		50.00
Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas (other than Southeastern), cut above crown.		50.00
Oregon, Washington, and Texas (Southeastern), cut above crown.		50.00
Oregon and Washington, cut below crown.		50.00
New York and Pennsylvania (Northern), cut above crown.		50.00
California, uncut.		50.00
All other States, cut above crown.		50.00

TOMATOES		Price per ton
California, Southern.		27.00
Italian.		27.00
California, other than Southern.		25.00
Italian.		27.00
Oregon, Washington, and Northern and Southwestern Idaho.		24.00
Idaho (other than Northern and Southwestern), Montana, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Massachusetts.		24.00
Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina.		24.00
New Jersey.		29.00
Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York (Southeastern).		28.00
New York other than Southeastern, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Pennsylvania (Northern).		25.00
Pennsylvania other than Northern, Maryland (Washington, Allegany and Garrett Counties), Virginia (Mainland), and West Virginia.		27.00
Maryland (remainder of State), Delaware, Virginia (Eastern Shore).		28.00

MISCELLANEOUS VEGETABLES		Price per ton
Fordhook lima beans, pimientos, pumpkin, squash, and any other vegetables not designated in the items above but still under price control.		1942 price plus 20 percent

¹ These prices are on an individual-processor basis and are not at the same levels as those designated in 1945.

² Southeastern Idaho: Franklin, Oneida, Bannock, and Bear Lake Counties.

³ Eastern Shore Virginia: Accomac and Northampton Counties.

⁴ Central and Eastern Iowa: The area in Iowa south and east of and including the counties of Clayton, Fayette, Bremer, Butler, Franklin, Wright, Humboldt, Pocahontas, Buena Vista, Sac, Calhoun, Webster, Boone, Dallas, Madison, Union, and Ringgold.

⁵ Northwestern Utah: Box Elder, Cache, Davis, Morgan, Salt Lake, Utah and Weber Counties.

⁶ Northern Idaho: The counties in Idaho north of and including Idaho County.

⁷ Southwestern Idaho: The counties in Idaho south and west of and including the counties of Adams, Valley, Boise, Elmore, Canyon, Lincoln, Minidoka, and Cassia.

⁸ Western Washington: Counties of Whatcom, Skagit, Snohomish, King, Pierce, Lewis, Skamania, Clark, Clark, Wahkiakum, Pacific, Thurston, Grays Harbor, Mason, Kitsap, Jefferson, Clallam, Island, and San Juan.

⁹ Southwestern Iowa: Counties of Mills, Fremont, Davis, Morgan, Salt Lake, Utah and Weber Counties.

¹⁰ Southeastern Wisconsin: All counties in Wisconsin south and east of and including the counties of Marinette, Oconto, Shawano, Waupaca, Adams, Juneau, Sauk, Richland, and Crawford.

¹¹ Northwestern Wisconsin: All counties in Wisconsin north and west of those listed in ¹⁰.

(Concluded on page 72)

Stocks of Canned Tomatoes

The civilian supply of canned tomatoes for the 1945-46 marketing season totaled 13,818,000 cases basis 24 No. 2's, the Association's Division of Statistics has reported. This was approximately the same as the civilian supply of 13,268,000 cases for the 1944-45 marketing season. The sharp reduction in this year's pack was offset by reduced government requirements.

Civilian stocks on January 1, 1946, totaled 1,823,564 actual cases, equivalent to 2,271,000 cases basis 24 No. 2's. This compares with civilian stocks of 2,302,000 cases basis No. 2's a year earlier. The details of supplies, stocks and shipments of canned tomatoes, as compiled from reports of canners who packed about 85 percent of the 1945 pack, are shown below:

SUPPLY, STOCKS, AND SHIPMENTS (BASIS 24/2's)

	1944-45 Cases	1945-46 Cases
Carryover stocks, July 1	(*)	60,000
Pack	26,099,000	16,758,000
Total supply	26,099,000	16,818,000
Government purchases	12,831,000	3,000,000
Supply	13,268,000	13,818,000
Stocks, Jan. 1	2,303,000	2,271,000
Shipments, July 1 to Jan. 1	10,965,000	11,547,000

STOCKS ON JANUARY 1, 1946

	Can Size	Actual Cases
24/2		741,904
24/3		762,710
6/10		316,450
Miscellaneous		2,100
Total		1,823,564

*Carryover stocks negligible. *Expected government purchases from 1945 pack.

Canned Fresh Lima Bean Pack

The pack of canned and glass-packed fresh lima beans in 1945 totaled 1,551,245 actual cases of all sizes of containers, as compared with 1,569,706 cases in 1944, according to figures compiled by the Association's Division of Statistics. Of the total pack, 1,403,126 cases were packed in No. 2 cans, 127,006 cases were packed in No. 10 cans, and the remaining 21,113 cases were packed in miscellaneous sizes of tin and glass containers.

The 1945 pack, as compared with the 1944 pack, by principal States, follows:

State	1944 Actual cases	1945 Actual cases
Maryland	288,213	250,385
Delaware	265,789	468,691
Pennsylvania and New Jersey	26,631	22,656
Ohio	23,510	26,641
Michigan	95,591	72,634
Wisconsin	121,673	94,936
Other States	748,297	615,282
Total	1,569,706	1,551,245

(Concluded from page 71)

¹² Northern Pennsylvania: Counties of Erie, Crawford, Mercer, Venango, Warren, Forest, McKean, Potter, Tioga, Bradford, Susquehanna, and Wayne.
¹³ The price for these areas is \$100.00 when cut above the crown, trimmed, and delivered to Baltimore.
¹⁴ Southeastern Texas: The area south and east of and including the counties of Webb, McMullen, Live Oak, Karnes, DeWitt, Lavaca, Colorado, Austin, Waller, Harris, and Chambers.
¹⁵ Based on cutting above the crown.
¹⁶ Southern California: Counties in California south of and including counties of Santa Barbara, Ventura, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino.
¹⁷ Southeastern New York: Counties of Greene, Columbia, Ulster, Dutchess, Putnam, Westchester, Rockland, Orange, Albany, and Rensselaer and all of Long Island.

Designated Area Average Prices for Freezing

	Price per ton
ASPARAGUS	1942 price plus \$ 40.00
Oregon and Washington ¹	1942 price plus \$ 30.00
All other States ¹	
BEANS, FRESH, LIMA, OTHER THAN FORDHOOK TYPE	
New Jersey	\$133.00
Arkansas, Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho other than Southeastern ²	120.00
New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia (Eastern Shore) ³ , Utah, Wyoming, and Southeast Idaho ⁴	105.00
All other States and areas	100.00
CORN, SWEET	
Maine and New Hampshire	28.00
Washington, Oregon, Utah, and Idaho	23.00
Vermont	22.00
New York	21.00
Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Indiana, Illinois, and Central and Eastern Iowa ⁵	19.50
Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Missouri	17.50
All other States and areas	17.50
PEAS, GREEN	
New Jersey	111.00
Oregon, Western ⁶	98.00
Delaware and Maryland	91.00
Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut	90.50
Virginia	89.50
Washington, (Western) ⁷ , and Idaho	89.00
Maine and Utah	88.50
New York	88.00
Iowa (other than Southwestern) ⁸ , West Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, and Tennessee	85.00
Illinois and Wisconsin (Southeastern) ⁹	82.50
Minnesota, Wisconsin (Northwestern) ¹⁰ , Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina	81.00
Arkansas	80.50
Ohio	79.00
Washington, other than Western ¹¹ , and Oregon other than Western ¹² (except Malheur County)	78.50
Michigan and Texas	77.50
Indiana and Oregon (Malheur County)	76.50
Missouri, Iowa (Southwestern) ¹³ , Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Kansas	76.00
Arizona and Nevada	74.00
California, Colorado and Montana	73.50
North Dakota and South Dakota	73.00
Wyoming	71.00
New Mexico	
SPINACH	
Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania (other than Northern) ¹⁴ , cut below crown	70.00
Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas (other than Southeastern) ¹⁵ , cut above crown	70.00
Oregon, Washington, and Texas (Southeastern) ¹⁶ , cut above crown	50.00
Oregon and Washington, cut below crown	55.00
New York and Pennsylvania (Northern) ¹⁷ , cut above crown	34.00
California, uncut ¹⁸	22.50
All other States, cut above crown	32.00
MISCELLANEOUS VEGETABLES	
Fordhook lima beans, broccoli, cauliflower, pumpkin, squash, and any other vegetable not designated in items above but still under price control ¹⁹	1942 price plus 20 percent

¹ These prices are on an individual-processor basis.² Southeastern Idaho: Franklin, Oneida, Bannock, and Bear Lake Counties.³ Eastern Shore Virginia: Accomac and Northampton Counties.⁴ Central and Eastern Iowa: The area in Iowa south and east of and including the counties of Clayton, Fayette, Bremer, Butler, Franklin, Wright, Humboldt, Pocahontas, Buena Vista, Sac, Calhoun, Webster, Boone, Dallas, Madison, Union, and Ringgold.⁵ Western Oregon: Counties in Oregon west of and including Wallowa, Marion, Linn, Lane, Douglas, and Jackson.⁶ Western Washington: Whatcom, Skagit, Snohomish, King, Pierce, Lewis, Skamania, Cowlitz, Clark, Wahkiakum, Pacific, Thurston, Grays Harbor, Mason, Kitsap, Jefferson, Clallam, Island, and San Juan Counties.⁷ Southwestern Iowa: Mills, Fremont, and Page Counties.⁸ Southeastern Wisconsin: All counties in Wisconsin south and east of and including the counties of Marinette, Oconto, Shawano, Waupaca, Adams, Juneau, Sauk, Richland, and Crawford.⁹ Northwestern Wisconsin: All counties in Wisconsin north and west of those listed in ⁸.¹⁰ Northern Pennsylvania: Counties of Erie, Crawford, Mercer, Venango, Warren, Forest, McKean, Potter, Tioga, Bradford, Susquehanna, and Wayne.¹¹ Southeastern Texas: The area in Texas south and east of and including the counties of Webb, McMullen, Live Oak, Karnes, DeWitt, Lavaca, Colorado, Austin, Waller, Harris, and Chambers.¹² Based on cutting above the crown.

Parity Index Up 1 Point to New 25-Year High, USDA Reports

The parity index advanced 1 point to a new 25-year high during the month ended December 15, the U. S. Department of Agriculture reported this week. This was the third one-point rise in the parity index in four months. At 176 percent of the 1910-14 average the index of prices paid, interest, and taxes was 5 points up from a year ago. The general level of farm product prices was 207 percent of the August 1900-July 1914 average in mid-December, 2 points higher than a month earlier. Prices received by farmers for both crops and livestock products averaged higher in mid-December than a month earlier, with fruit prices making the most substantial gains on the crop side and egg prices showing the biggest rise in the livestock and products category.

The index of crop prices on December 15, 1945, was 206 percent of the 1900-14 average compared with 203 in November and 196 a year ago. A 13-point rise in the fruit index was accompanied by minor upturns in prices received for cotton, and feed grain and hay. Truck crop prices declined contra-seasonally from 235 in November to 223 while food grain prices at 178 and oil bearing crops at 213 were unchanged from November 15.

Total crop supplies moving to market in December were seasonally smaller than a month earlier but about as large as a year ago. Shipments of fruit and vegetables during the four weeks ended December 15 also were larger than in the comparable period in 1944. Total crop production in the United States in 1945 was the third largest on record, being exceeded by 2 percent in 1942 and about 1½ percent in 1944.

Effect on Snapping Asparagus

The effect on yield and harvesting costs of snapping asparagus in the field instead of cutting stalks in the usual manner is discussed in the November 1945, issue of the quarterly bulletin of the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station. An experiment was initiated to investigate this method as a means of speeding up the harvesting process and reducing labor requirements, and it is reported that on the whole both the canners who cooperated in making the tests and the growers were pleased with the system of field snapping after a full season's trial in 1945. It is pointed out that canners experimenting with this method will find it advantageous to give growers careful instructions, preferably in the field at the time harvest first begins.

ICC Issues Two Orders in an Effort to Ease Car Shortages

The Interstate Commerce Commission recently issued two emergency orders designed to help relieve the critical shortage of refrigerator and box cars. The first order permits the substitution of refrigerator cars for box cars in shipments from the East to certain Western States. The order is aimed at reducing the pressing box car shortage in the West.

The Commission ruled that wherever freight and facilities are suitable for loading, three RS-type refrigerator cars can be substituted for each box car. Carload minimum weights applicable to box car shipments must be adhered to.

Wherever the carload minimum weight varies with the size of the car, two refrigerator cars may be substituted for one 40' 7" long (or shorter) box car. Three refrigerator cars may be used in place of one box car over 40' 7" long, but not more than 50' 7" long.

The Commission also suspended all tariff rules and regulations insofar as they conflict with this order, which will expire on February 21.

The second order is designed to expedite the speedy removal and return of empty refrigerator cars. It provides that railroads shall remove each refrigerator car within 24 hours after unloading, forwarding it to a point where perishables are loaded, or delivering it to a connecting road for return to loading point. Railroads must report

1945 Canned Tomato Pack

The 1945 canned tomato pack amounted to 14,470,550 actual cases, equivalent to 16,757,750 cases basis 24/2's, the Association's Division of

daily by telegraph to the ICC, furnishing the initials and numbers of cars still held, and explain why they haven't been returned.

The order will not apply to special and general permits, issued to meet exceptional circumstances. It will also not apply to refrigerator cars being substituted for box cars at loading point, or to refrigerator cars actually required and used by a road for loading less-than-carload merchandise, when the destination of the car is in the direction of the empty movement. The second order expires February 15.

Canned Tomato Juice Stocks

The civilian supply of canned tomato juice, canned tomato juice cocktail and mixtures containing 70 percent or more tomato juice for the 1945-46 marketing season, totaled 28,589,000 cases basis No. 2's, compared with 17,009,000 cases for the 1944-45 marketing season, the N.C.A. Division of Statistics reports.

Civilian supplies were increased in spite of a reduced pack because of sharply lower government buying, the Division states.

Civilian stocks on January 1, 1946, totaled 6,460,368 actual cases equivalent to 7,432,000 cases basis No. 2's. This compares with January 1, 1945, civilian stocks of 6,788,000 cases basis No. 2's.

Civilian shipments from August 1 to January 1 of the current marketing season totaled 21,157,000 cases or slightly more than double the civilian

Statistics has reported. This is the smallest pack since 1931 and is only 70 percent as large as the 1944 pack, the Division states. The 1945 tomato pack in actual cases by States and can sizes is shown below:

	24/2	48/1P	24/303	24/2½	6/10	Misc. tin and Glass	Total
	Cases	Cases	Cases	Cases	Cases	Cases	Cases
New York.....	90,001	58,110	150,424	307,525
Maryland.....	1,774,064	219,416	408,253	2,401,733
Delaware.....	5,025	13,859	18,884
New Jersey.....	21,243	60	7,300	50,820	88,423
Pennsylvania.....	300,852	61,410	125,543	487,805
Virginia and West Virginia.....	1,360,733	190,268	51,904	1,602,905
Ohio.....	635,598	248,606	234,349	1,118,556
Indiana.....	989,885	378,879	360,777	1,729,541
Tennessee and Kentucky.....	210,730	26,804	45,915	283,458
Arkansas and Missouri.....	1,656,391	107	74,264	98,778	1,829,630
Colorado.....	155,915	64,333	62,362	282,630
Utah.....	87,459	202,683	73,768	363,880
California.....	107,461	1,547,938	619,229	6,011	2,280,039
Other States.....	1,307,350	9,644	158,458	190,088	295	1,674,841
Total U. S.....	8,702,812	9,841	60	3,238,462	2,513,000	6,306	14,470,550

shipments during the corresponding period of the 1944-45 marketing season.

The details of supplies, stocks and shipments of canned tomato juice, tomato juice cocktail and mixtures containing 70 percent or more tomato juice as compiled from reports of the corresponding period of 1944-45.

SUPPLY, STOCKS, AND SHIPMENTS (BASIS 24/2's)

	1944-45	1945-46
	Cases	Cases
Carryover stocks, Aug. 1	200,000	200,000
Pack.....	30,800,000	28,380,000
Total supply.....	31,000,000	28,580,000
Government purchases.....	14,000,000	(*)
Supply.....	17,000,000	28,580,000
Stocks, Jan. 1.....	6,788,000	7,432,000
Shipments, Aug. 1-Jan. 1	10,221,000	21,157,000

*Very light government purchases from 1945 pack.

STOCKS ON JANUARY 1, 1946

	Cans per Case	Actual Cases
No. 300.....	48	45
No. 1 tall.....	48	2,021
No. 303 cyl.....	24	44
No. 2.....	24	2,844,362
No. 2 cyl.....	24	636
No. 3 cyl.....	12	2,770,533
No. 10.....	6	756,695
Miscellaneous tin.....	12,756
Glass.....	73,273
Total.....	6,460,368
Total (basis 24/2's).....	7,432,000

Stocks of Canned Sweet Corn

Civilian stocks of canned sweet corn in canners' hands January 1, 1946, were 9,793,926 actual cases equivalent to 9,278,000 cases basis No. 2's, according to the Association's Division of Statistics. These compare with January 1, 1945, civilian stocks of 5,126,000 cases, basis No. 2's.

Shipments by canners of sweet corn in December, 1945, were 3,120,215 actual cases, equivalent to 3,049,000 cases basis No. 2's. Shipments of canned sweet corn in December, 1944, were 2,369,000 cases basis No. 2's.

The table shown below is based on reports from canners who packed about 88 percent of the 1945 pack, together with estimates for those not reporting to the Division:

SUPPLY, STOCKS, AND SHIPMENTS (BASIS 24/2's)

	1944-45	1945-46
	Cases	Cases
Carryover stocks, Aug. 1	400,000	100,000
Pack.....	25,089,100	28,236,000
Total supply.....	25,489,100	28,336,000
Government purchases.....	7,160,000	-750,000
Supply.....	18,329,100	27,586,000
Stocks, Jan. 1.....	5,126,000	9,278,000
Shipments during Dec.	2,369,000	3,049,000
Shipments, Aug. 1 to Jan. 1.....	13,203,100	18,308,900

*Expected government purchases from 1945 pack.

(Concluded on next page)

STOCKS IN CANNERS' HANDS, JAN. 1, 1946

	Stocks Dec. 1, 1945 Actual Cases	Stocks Jan. 1, 1946 Actual Cases	Shipments during Dec. 1945 Actual Cases
Eastern States			
Cream style:			
White...	304,604	190,527	114,167
Golden...	1,311,883	823,981	387,922
Whole grain:			
Golden...	695,887	533,204	162,683
White...	153,424	81,691	71,733
Total...	2,365,888	1,629,383	736,505
Western States			
Cream style:			
White...	1,502,809	1,182,152	410,657
Golden...	3,716,757	2,964,230	752,537
Whole grain:			
Golden...	5,083,259	3,920,903	1,162,356
White...	155,428	97,208	58,100
Total...	10,549,253	8,164,543	2,383,710
Total U. S.	12,914,141	9,793,926	3,120,215

Stocks of Canned Peas

Civilian stocks of canned peas in canners' hands, January 1, 1946, totaled 7,180,588 actual cases equivalent to 7,411,000 cases basis No. 2's, according to the Association's Division of Statistics. These compare with January 1, 1945, stocks of 3,521,000 cases basis No. 2's.

Shipments of canned peas during December, 1945, were 1,444,555 actual cases, equivalent to 1,503,000 cases basis No. 2's. Shipments of canned peas in December, 1944, were 1,400,000 cases basis No. 2's.

The table shown below is based on reports from canners who packed about 85 percent of the 1945 pack, together with estimates for those not reporting:

	SUPPLY, STOCKS, AND SHIPMENTS (BASIS 24 2's)		
	1944-45 Cases	1945-46 Cases	Shipments
Supply....	10,647,000	35,868,000	
Stocks, Jan. 1....	3,521,000	7,411,000	
Shipments during Dec....	1,400,000	1,503,000	
Shipments June 1-Jan. 1....	16,126,000	28,487,000	
 Stocks			
Dec. 1, 1945	Stocks Actual Cases	Stocks 1946 Actual Cases	Shipments during Dec. 1945 Actual Cases
New York and Maine			
Alaskas....	382	430	48
Sweets....	614,800	447,193	167,706
Mid-Atlantic			
Alaskas....	115,474	115,207	207
Sweets....	130,326	104,635	25,688
Mid-West			
Alaskas....	2,313,437	1,805,175	408,962
Sweets....	3,061,500	2,870,970	481,536
Western			
Alaskas....	130,512	97,553	32,950
Sweets....	2,358,587	2,030,423	328,165
Total U. S.			
Alaskas....	2,450,805	2,018,365	441,440
Sweets....	6,165,318	5,162,233	1,003,095

USDA Issues Canned Fruit and Vegetable Pack Statistics

Estimates of the 1945 commercial packs of canned fruits and vegetables were announced this week by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, together with the supplies of these foods available to civilians for the period July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1946.

On the basis of total deliveries from markets of 61.8 million cases (24 2 1/2's) of canned fruit and juices, excluding citrus and 275 million cases (24 2's) of canned vegetables, including baby food, soups, and other miscellaneous products, approximately 45.1 million cases of canned fruit and fruit juices, and 247.5 million cases of canned vegetables is available for U. S. civilian markets. These amounts compare with 34.3 million cases and 204.4 million cases, respectively, available during the same period last year.

Although the packs of peaches, pears, beets, pens, baked beans, and baby foods are larger than in previous years, heavy spring frosts during 1945 in some crop areas and excessive rains in others reduced the total quantities of

fruits and vegetables available for commercial canning. The 1945 packs of peaches and pears were second only to those of 1942.

Canned Food Shipments Increase

Freight car loadings in the first quarter of 1946 are expected to be four percent below those in the same period in 1945, according to estimates just compiled by the 13 Shipper's Advisory Boards and made public this week. On the basis of those estimates, freight car loadings of the 30 principal commodities will be 6,417,622 cars in the first quarter of 1946, compared with 6,687,339 actual car loadings for the same commodities in the corresponding period in the preceding year.

Sales of Independents Gain

Sales of independent retail food stores were 8 percent higher for December, 1945, than for December, 1944, and were 10 percent higher for December than for November of this year, according to preliminary data released this week by the Director of Census.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Convention issue.....	31
Convention sidelights.....	31
Sustained production, with emphasis on foreign trade chief convention highlight.....	31
Excerpts from speech on postwar agriculture.....	34
The industry's sanitation program.....	34
Army postwar plan for canned food procurement.....	36
The United States and the British Commonwealth and the world of tomorrow.....	37
Nutrition research and the food industry.....	39
Opportunities in appetites offered by canned foods.....	41
OPA's program for the 1946 pack of processed fruits and vegetables.....	42
1946 program for processed fruits and vegetables—a panel discussion by USDA officials.....	46
Postwar foreign trade—a challenge to American enterprise.....	47
Report on legislation affecting the fisheries.....	47
Why I don't serve canned fish more often.....	50
The FAO and its effect on the American fisheries.....	51
Status of DDT in the control of insects of importance to the canning industry.....	54
New methods of weed control in canning crops.....	56
Resolutions adopted by the National Canners Association at the annual Convention.....	58
Election of officers.....	61
1946 Finance Committee.....	61
Legislative Committee report at Directors' meeting.....	62
Report of Association's Committee on Committees.....	63
Report of the N. C. A. Labeling Committee.....	64
Report on containers.....	65
Sauerkraut canners meeting.....	65
Raw products conferences.....	66
N. C. A. fisheries conference.....	66
Board of Directors meet.....	67
Manpower conference.....	67
Annual reports to be mailed.....	67
Meetings of committees.....	68
Introducing Emil Rutz.....	68
M-81 direction enclosed.....	68
Other Association officers.....	68
Plant sanitation, waste disposal.....	68
Congress summary.....	70
1946 program for processed vegetables announced by USDA and OPA.....	70
Stocks of canned tomatoes.....	71
Canned fresh lima bean pack.....	71
Parity index up 1 point to new 25-year high, USDA reports.....	72
Effect on snapping asparagus.....	72
ICC issues two orders in an effort to ease car shortage.....	73
1945 canned tomato pack.....	73
Canned tomato juice stocks.....	73
Stocks of canned sweet corn.....	73
Stocks of canned peas.....	74
USDA issues canned fruit and vegetable pack statistics.....	74
Canned food shipments increase.....	74
Sale of independent gain.....	74